

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



THESIS

**EDUCATING TOMORROW'S LEADERS TODAY: A COMPARISON OF
THE OFFICER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES
NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY**

by

Dennis J. Volpe

June 2003

Thesis Co-Advisors:

Alice Crawford
Jeff McCausland

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 2003	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Educating Tomorrow's Leaders Today: A Comparison of the Officer Development Programs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Volpe, Dennis J.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) The United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy are recognized for developing young men and women into both prominent military and civilian leaders. While their missions are similar, there are differences in the approach each Academy undertakes to achieve this endstate. The purpose of this thesis is to investigate and evaluate how officer development is applied at the respective service academies, what similarities and differences exist, what the respective strengths and weaknesses of each program are, and to discuss the future developments of the officer development programs. Chapter I provides an introduction including the background, methodology, and organization of this thesis. Chapter II examines the core values, missions, and visions of the two service academies. Chapter III compares current leadership theory to the concept of the military as a profession as introduced by Samuel Huntington (1957) and James Burk (2002). Chapter IV describes the leadership/management/ethics courses and the character development programs in place at the two service academies. Chapter V discusses the methods and procedures used during the research phase of this thesis. Chapter VI reveals the themes present from the data collected and Chapter VII presents the conclusions, recommendations, and areas for future research.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Leadership Development, Character Development, Leadership, Character			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 112	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**EDUCATING TOMORROW'S LEADERS TODAY: A COMPARISON OF THE
OFFICER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL
ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY**

Dennis J. Volpe
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1996

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
LEADERSHIP AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2003**

Author: Dennis J. Volpe

Approved by: Alice Crawford
Thesis Co-Advisor

Colonel Jeffrey McCausland, USA (ret)
Thesis Co-Advisor

Douglas A. Brook, Ph.D.
Dean, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

The United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy are recognized for developing young men and women into both prominent military and civilian leaders. While their missions are similar, there are differences in the approach each Academy undertakes to achieve this endstate. The purpose of this thesis is to investigate and evaluate how officer development is applied at the respective service academies, what similarities and differences exist, what the respective strengths and weaknesses of each program are, and to discuss the future developments of the officer development programs. Chapter I provides an introduction including the background, methodology, and organization of this thesis. Chapter II examines the core values, missions, and visions of the two service academies. Chapter III compares current leadership theory to the concept of the military as a profession as introduced by Samuel Huntington (1957) and James Burk (2002). Chapter IV describes the leadership/management/ethics courses and the character development programs in place at the two service academies. Chapter V discusses the methods and procedures used during the research phase of this thesis. Chapter VI reveals the themes present from the data collected and Chapter VII presents the conclusions, recommendations, and areas for future research.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
B.	PURPOSE.....	1
C.	METHODOLOGY	2
D.	ORGANIZATION OF STUDY	3
II.	CORE VALUES, MISSION, AND VISION STATEMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.....	5
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	5
B.	U.S. NAVY AND AIR FORCE CORE VALUES	5
C.	NAVAL/AIR FORCE ACADEMY VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS	6
D.	STRATEGIC PLANS OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY.....	8
1.	United States Naval Academy Strategic Plan.....	8
2.	Focus Area: Character Building.....	8
a.	<i>Strategic Initiatives</i>	8
b.	<i>Tactical Initiatives</i>.....	9
3.	Focus Area: Leadership and Professional Experience	9
a.	<i>Strategic Initiatives</i>	9
b.	<i>Tactical Initiatives (Training)</i>	9
4.	United States Air Force Academy Strategic Plan	9
E.	“THE AGENDA FOR CHANGE” AND “THE HIGHER STANDARD”	12
1.	“The Agenda for Change”.....	12
2.	“The Higher Standard”.....	13
F.	CONCLUSION	14
III.	THE MILITARY PROFESSION.....	17
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	17
B.	CONCEPT OF PROFESSION.....	17
C.	LEGITIMACY AND TRANSFORMATIONAL/VISIONARY LEADERSHIP:	19
D.	JURISDICTION AND MORAL LEADERSHIP	22
E.	EXPERTISE AND PERSONAL MASTERY	25
F.	CONCLUSION	28
IV.	LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY	29
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	29
B.	LEADERSHIP/ETHICS CORE COURSES AT USNA	29

C.	LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT/ETHICS CORE COURSES OFFERED AT USAFA.....	31
D.	CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AT USNA/USAFA	32
1.	Fourth-Class Year:	32
a.	USNA: 4/C Leader of Character Seminars – Honor.....	32
b.	USAFA: VECTOR-- Vital Effective Character Through Observation and Reflection	33
2.	Third-Class Year:	33
a.	USNA: 3/C Leader of Character Seminars – Courage:	33
b.	USAFA: Respect and Responsibility (R & R) Workshops: ..	33
3.	Second-Class Year:	33
a.	USNA: 2/C Character Development Seminars: Commitment	33
	Enrichment.....	33
b.	.USAFA: LIFT-- Leaders in Flight Today:	34
4.	First-Class Year:	34
b.	USAFA: Capstone: Eagle Aces	35
E.	CONCLUSION	35
V.	METHOD AND PROCEDURE	39
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	39
B.	ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER	39
C.	DATA COLLECTION	40
1.	Question Formulation.....	42
2.	Senior Academy Officer Interviews	43
3.	Leadership and Character Development Faculty Interviews.....	43
4.	Service Academy Exchange Midshipmen/Cadets Focus Groups and Interviews	44
5.	Army War College at Carlisle Senior Officer Interviews	45
D.	DATA ANALYSIS	46
E.	CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	47
VI:	THEMES	49
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	49
B.	THEME I: LEADERSHIP IS ABOUT INFLUENCE	50
1.	Theme.....	50
2.	Justification	50
3.	Conclusion	53
C.	THEME II: LEADERSHIP IS LEARNED BOTH THROUGH ACADEMICS AND EXPERIENCE	53
1.	Theme.....	53
2.	Justification	54
D.	THEME III: CHARACTER IS ABOUT DOING THE RIGHT THING	60
1.	Theme.....	60
2.	Justification	60
3.	Conclusions.....	61

E.	THEME IV: INTEGRATION BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENTS AT BOTH SERVICE ACADEMIES NEEDS TO BE INCREASED.	62
1.	Theme.....	62
2.	Justification	62
3.	Conclusions.....	65
F.	THEME V: COOPERATION AND SYNERGY BETWEEN THE SERVICE ACADEMIES NEEDS TO BE INCREASED.	65
1.	Theme.....	65
2.	Justification	66
3.	Conclusion	69
G.	THEME VI: MORE TIME, CREDITS, AND EMPHASIS SHOULD BE PLACED ON LEADERSHIP AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT	69
1.	Theme.....	69
2.	Justification	69
3.	Conclusion	73
H.	THEME VII: NAVAL ACADEMY LEADERSHIP AND CHARACTER INSTRUCTORS NEED MORE ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS.	73
1.	Theme.....	73
2.	Justification	73
I.	SUMMARY:.....	77
VII:	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	79
A.	CONCLUSIONS	79
B.	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	81
	Recommendations:.....	81
C.	UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY RECOMMENDATIONS:	82
	Recommendations:.....	82
D.	AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	83
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	87
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	91
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	95

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Comparison of Service Academy Leadership/ Management Faculty . . .	76
----------	--	----

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge and thank those individuals who provided their support throughout the information gathering phase of this thesis:

Captain Dave Willmann, United States Navy, Senior Navy Service Officer, Army War College

Colonel “Slim” Connors, United States Air Force, Senior Air Force Service Officer, Army War College

James Smith, Captain, United States Navy, Director of the Division of Professional Development, United States Naval Academy

James Campbell, Captain, United States Navy, Director of the Division of Character Development, United States Naval Academy

Dana Born, Colonel, United States Air Force, Director of the Division of Behavioral Science and Leadership Department, United States Air Force Academy

John Herd, Colonel, United States Air Force, Director of the Division of Character Development, United States Air Force Academy

Corky Vazquez, Captain, United States Navy, Chairman, Leadership, Ethics, and Law Department, United States Naval Academy

Carl Deputy, Commander, United States Navy, Leadership Section Head, United States Naval Academy

Jeffrey Nelson, Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Leadership Directorate Head, United States Air Force Academy

Russell Sojourner, Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Director Character and Leadership Division

Chris Florek, Captain, United States Air Force, Training Wing, United States Air Force Academy

Navy and Air Force Students at the Army War College, Carlisle Barracks,
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Director and Students of the Leadership Education and Development Program
(LEAD), United States Naval Academy

Faculty and Administration of the Behavioral Science and Leadership
Department, United States Air Force Academy

Faculty and Administration of the Center for Character Development, United
States Air Force Academy

Faculty and Administration of the Leadership, Ethics, and Law Department,
United States Naval Academy

Faculty and Administration of the Character Development Department, United
States Naval Academy

United States Wing of Cadets, United States Air Force Academy

United States Brigade of Midshipmen, United States Naval Academy

The author would like to specifically acknowledge and thank his thesis advisors
for their dedication and patience through this process. A special thanks to:

Alice Crawford, Naval Postgraduate School, LEAD Program and Graduate
School of Business and Public Policy

Jeff McCausland, Colonel, United States Army (Retired), Class of 1961 Professor
of Leadership, United States Naval Academy

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

The United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy possess rich traditions and remarkable heritages. Both Academies are recognized for developing young men and women into both prominent military and civilian leaders. Since its founding in 1845, the United States Naval Academy has produced decorated and storied war heroes and leaders of industry and government, including numerous Congressman and Senators as well as one President of the United States. The Air Force Academy was established in 1955 and has less of a storied history, but does have a similar vision, mission, and purpose. While the visions and missions of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy are to develop future leaders, there are differences in the approach each Academy undertakes to achieve this end state.

The officer development programs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy are the most important feature distinguishing them from other educational institutions and other commissioning sources. Each service academy offers leadership and character development education as part of the core curriculum. The classroom instruction of midshipmen and cadets is then coupled with a training environment that allows for the application of leadership theory. These programs have been recognized for developing young men and women for their future roles as military and civilian professionals (USNA Board of Visitor Report, “The Higher Standard,” 1997).

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate how officer development is applied at the two service academies, identify the similarities and differences that exist, determine the respective strengths and weaknesses of each program, and discuss the future directions of their officer development programs. The intent of this thesis is to provide the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy with specific information and recommendations concerning their officer development programs.

C. METHODOLOGY

In an effort to provide a better landscape of the mission and purpose of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy's officer development programs, a literature review looks at the three specific areas. First, the history and progression of the officer development programs at academies are examined to provide a broad overview of the construct of officer development at these institutions.

Next, there are three elements of the military learning triad. An entering argument of the researcher is that the profession of arms, the military profession, requires core competencies regardless of service. Training, education, and experience are the three tenets that promote a learning environment to develop those core competencies. Legitimacy, jurisdiction, and expertise are the competencies that make an occupation a profession. Current trends in leadership education are reviewed and aligned with Samuel Huntington's concept of a military profession. Finally, the visions, missions, and strategic plans are reviewed for each institution to identify possible areas for future development within the spectrum of officer development.

Focus groups and interviews were conducted at each service academy to identify common themes among the midshipmen/cadets, faculty and staff, and the senior administration to provide a measurement of internal perceptions of effectiveness of the officer development programs. Service academy exchange midshipmen/cadets, those midshipmen/cadets who spent a semester at their sister service academy, were targeted in the midshipmen/cadet level focus groups and interviews because of their unique situation of experiencing officer development programs at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy. This group is able to provide valuable insight into the similarities and differences between the two service academies and any areas for possible improvement.

Interviews were conducted with leadership and character development faculty and staff at each academy to identify any common themes concerning the effectiveness and the implementation of the officer development programs, and how each academy is

performing in the area of officer development. Interviews were also conducted with senior administrators at each institution to identify the desired outcomes of the officer development programs.

Finally, interviews of senior service officers (Navy and Air Force) were conducted at the Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania to identify the desired end state of service academy officer development from a senior officer perspective. These desired end states are compared with those of senior service academy officials and the common themes identified by faculty/staff and service academy exchange midshipmen/cadets. The Army War College is used because of proximity to the United States Naval Academy and the joint makeup of its student population.

Leadership education and development has been a topic of interest in recent years as evidenced by the vast amount of current literature pertaining to leadership, and it is necessary to identify the common themes and benchmarks discussed in today's literature. Various leadership and character development studies are discussed and compared to the direction set by each institution's strategic plan to identify any possible areas for academy improvement.

D. ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

This thesis includes seven chapters. Chapter II provides a brief introduction to the service-specific core values and the visions, missions, and strategic plans of the Air Force and Naval Academy in terms of officer development. Chapter III describes the concept of a profession introduced by Samuel Huntington in his book *Soldier and Soldier* (1957) and expounded upon by James Burk in his article, *Expertise, Jurisdiction, and Legitimacy in the Military Profession* (2002). Chapter IV provides an overview of the core leadership/management courses offered and mandated at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy. Chapter V describes the research methodologies used. Chapter VI discusses the common themes present in the various interview and focus group sessions. Chapter VII provides conclusions and recommendations for possible future research.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. CORE VALUES, MISSION, AND VISION STATEMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a brief introduction to the core values of the United States Air Force and Navy. A review of the visions and missions of the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy is presented along with a brief discussion concerning their strategic plans. The visions and missions are discussed to determine the similarities or deviations from service core values. The end result of this chapter is an appreciation of the core values of the Navy and Air Force and how they relate to mission and visions of the service academies.

B. U.S. NAVY AND AIR FORCE CORE VALUES

The Navy and the Air Force have both recognized the importance of espoused values for the success of an organization and have outlined the core values of their services very well. The core values of the Navy and Air Force provide service members a ready reference of acceptable and unacceptable behavior and the expectations for their respective services. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the core values of the Navy and the Air Force and, in the subsequent section, compare the core values espoused by the services to the missions and visions of their respective service academies.

From the early days of the naval service, certain principles or core values were established. They consist of three basic principles: honor, courage, and commitment. The official Navy website defines honor, courage, and commitment in very specific terms but best described by the following:

1. Honor: conduct oneself in the highest ethical manner in all relationships with peers, superiors, and subordinates;
2. Courage: Meet the demands of our profession and the mission when it is hazardous, demanding, or otherwise difficult;

3. Commitment: the day-to-day duty of every Navy man and woman is to work together as a team to improve the quality of our work, our people and ourselves.¹

Similarly, the Air Force goes into great detail to explain exactly what they expect from their officers and airmen with respect to the core values of their service. According to the “Little Blue Book,” the basic guide to the Air Force core values, the values are set forth with the definitions of “Integrity First, Service before Self, and Excellence in all we do.” Integrity is a character trait. It is the willingness to do what is right even when no one is looking. It is the “moral compass” the inner voice; the voice of self-control; the basis for the trust imperative in today’s military. “Service before self” explains how professional duties take precedence over personal duties and “Excellence in all we do” directs the Air Force to develop a sustained passion for improvement and innovation that will propel it into a long-term, upward spiral of accomplishment and performance.²

The core values of the Navy and Air Force are different in word usage but the same in overall meaning. There is not much difference between the definitions of “honor, courage, and commitment” and those espoused for “integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do.” The following section discusses and compares the visions and missions of the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academies to the standards set by the core values of their respective service.

C. NAVAL/AIR FORCE ACADEMY VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS

The missions of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy both focus on the development of young men and women into future military leaders with the development of certain traits. The mission of the United States Naval Academy is as follows:

To develop midshipmen morally, mentally, and physically and to imbue in them the highest ideals of duty, honor and loyalty in order to provide graduates who are dedicated to a career of naval service and have potential for future development in mind and character to assume the highest responsibilities of command, citizenship, and government³

¹ www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/traditions/html/corvalu.html

² www.usafa.af.mil/core-value/cv-mastr.html

³ www.usna.edu/strategicplan/

Similarly, the mission of the United States Air Force Academy is to “inspire and develop outstanding young men and women to become Air Force officers with knowledge, character, and discipline; motivated to lead the world’s greatest aerospace force in service to the nation.”⁴

When examining the mission of an organization, it is imperative to evaluate the vision in order to determine whether the mission, the roadmap, will reach the desired destination, the vision. The vision of the United States Naval Academy is to “provide leaders of great character, competence, vision, and drive to transform the Navy and Marine Corps and serve the nation in a century of promise and uncertainty.”⁵ Likewise, the vision of the United States Air Force Academy, “recognized worldwide as the premier developer of aerospace officers...leaders with impeccable character and essential knowledge. . . prepared and motivated to lead our Air Force and nation.”⁶

As evidenced in the core values of each service in the previous section, the visions and missions of both the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy are quite similar and emphasize the core values of their respective services. The Naval Academy wants to create leaders “of great character” for service to the nation by “developing them morally, mentally, and physically” and imbuing in them the highest ideals of “duty, honor, and loyalty.” It is evident that the vision and mission of the Naval Academy are in keeping with the core values of the naval service.

Similarly, the Air Force Academy wants to create leaders with “impeccable character and essential knowledge” by developing young men and women “with knowledge, character, and discipline” into Air Force officers. Therefore, the core values of “integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do” are also epitomized in the vision and mission of the Air Force Academy. Both emphasize the development of young men and women into leaders of character and vision while developing their

⁴ www.usafa.af.mil

⁵ www.usna.edu/strategicplan/

⁶ <http://www.usafa.af.mil/usafa-vision.html>

intellect and knowledge. The vision and mission of each service academy provide additional reinforcement for the core values of their respective services.

D. STRATEGIC PLANS OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the strategic plans of the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy and identify initiatives that relate to leadership and character development. Both institutions maintain strategic plans as a planning tool for future projects.

1. United States Naval Academy Strategic Plan

The Naval Academy's strategic plan, "Building Leaders for America (2002)," is broken down into eight institutional focus areas: academic excellence, admissions excellence, effective communications, character building, leadership and professional excellence, physical fitness, naval heritage, and Academy quality of life (USNA Strategic Plan 2002). The entering assumption of the Naval Academy's strategic plan is:

The United States Naval Academy is the premier institution for developing leaders of the Navy and Marine Corps who demonstrate the moral, mental and physical attributes needed to meet the challenges of combat and make lifetime contributions to the security and well-being of our nation through continued leadership, service and citizenship (USNA Strategic Plan 2002).

To achieve the desired goals in each focus area of the strategic plan, strategic and tactical initiatives were implemented. In the area of Leadership and Character Development, the following strategic and tactical initiatives are applicable:

2. Focus Area: Character Building

a. Strategic Initiatives

1. Renovate Mitscher Hall Facilities
2. Strengthen the Center for Professional Military Ethics

b. Tactical Initiatives

1. Promote an Inter-Service Academy Seminar on Civility, Dignity, and Respect.
2. Establish a Distinguished Military Professor in Character Development
3. Balance individual excellence with team building

3. Focus Area: Leadership and Professional Experience

a. Strategic Initiatives

1. Sustain integral USNA at-sea experience
2. Expand the Company Officer Leadership Masters Program
3. Create a Decision-Making and intellectual agility practicum
4. Support leadership development enhancements
5. Provide a net-centric occupational and warfighting lab

b. Tactical Initiatives (Training)

1. Reinstitute a Naval Academy flight training squadron
2. Provide midshipmen basic first-aid training
3. Improve the quality and availability of Small Arms/Live-Fire training facilities⁷

4. United States Air Force Academy Strategic Plan

The strategic plan of the United States Air Force Academy maintains a core vector that is essential to the mission and vision of the Air Force Academy and supported by the capstones of excellence similar to the strategic initiatives at the Naval Academy. The core vector of the United States Air Force Academy is “Military, academic, athletic, and character development programs required to graduate with a Bachelor of Science degree and be commissioned an Air Force officer and leader (USAFA Strategic Plan

⁷ USNA Strategic Plan 2002.

2001).” The core vector of the Air Force Academy’s strategic plan integrates the military, academic, athletic, and character development programs, known as core programs, currently in place at USAFA. In terms of leadership and character development, the following considerations concerning the core programs are applicable:

1. Provide cadets both educational and experiential introductions to expeditionary concepts of the Air Force.
2. Nurture an appreciation for Air Force heritage while instilling warrior ethos: mandate that the leadership and motivation developed from powered flight, soaring, and jump training remain a viable part of the USAFA experience.
3. Use character development programs to explicitly meet the demands of the Profession of Arms. ⁸

These basic considerations provided the avenue for the core goals and objectives of the USAFA Strategic Plan to be developed because they provided a framework to work from. These notions or values provided for a common emphasis for the Air Force Academy. These goals and objectives are similar in scope to the strategic and tactical initiatives of the Naval Academy’s strategic plan. The applicable leadership and character development goals and objectives are as follows:

- **Goal (0001): Sustain and enhance the Academy as the nation’s exemplar educational and military leadership development institution.**
 - a. Objective (001A): Optimize the integration of education and training programs across the Academy’s mission elements
 - b. Objective (001F): Sustain the Academy’s reputation as a center of innovative officership development of cadets.

⁸ <http://www.usafa.af.mil/usafa-vision.html>

- **Goal (002): Produce outstanding young men and women who are exceptionally prepared to join the profession of arms by refining character and officer development programs.**
 - a. Objective (002B): Develop the leadership skills in cadets necessary to make timely decisions to positively affect mission accomplishment.
- **Goal (005): Establish the Academy as a national leader in character development.**
 - a. Objective (005A): promote academic research into character development that will add to the conceptual foundation of the Academy's character development programs while integrating character development initiatives into all cadet programs.
 - b. Objective (005B): Develop year-round challenging experiential programs promoting character development.⁹

The capstone program of the Air Force Academy's strategic plan complements the core goals and objectives, and provides developmental experiences that ensure USAFA remains at the top of undergraduate institutions. The capstone goals and associated objectives directly relating to leadership and character development are:

1. Goal (001): Increase cadet exposure to professional programs that enhance their leadership and character development experiences.
 - a. Objective (001A): Prepare cadets for future multi-national, multi-service operations of the expeditionary Air Force by increasing participation in joint, combined and international experiences.

⁹<http://www.usafa.af.mil/usafa-vision.html>

2. Goal (002): Provide opportunities that expand cadet's personal horizons and benefit the Air Force by providing young officers with a more diverse and broad-based education.

a. Objective (002A): Increase community service opportunities for cadets.

3. Goal (003): Become the catalyst for instilling a sense of pride in Air Force and Air Force Academy heritage.

a. Objective (003B): Ensure facilities associated with character development and Air Force core values training appropriately reflect the Academy's commitment to character development.¹⁰

The relationship between the core values and the visions and missions of service academies is very much akin to the relationship between the values of the organization and their strategic plans. Both the Naval and Air Force Academies emphasize leadership and character development as two of the cornerstones of their institutions. This is clear in their respective vision and mission statements. Their strategic plans are similar in design and scope and both stress the importance of leadership and character development through their strategic and tactical initiatives and core vectors.

E. "THE AGENDA FOR CHANGE" AND "THE HIGHER STANDARD"

1. "The Agenda for Change"

Due to the sexual assault scandal at the Air Force Academy and the subsequent investigations,¹¹ the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff Air Force have implemented an "Agenda for Change (2003)" that dictates certain criteria in order for the Air Force Academy to remain a viable institution for the production of Air Force Officers.¹² The changes applicable to this thesis are:

¹⁰ <http://www.usafa.af.mil/usafa-vision.html>

¹¹ <http://www.theworldlink.com/articles/2003/02/28/news/news17.txt>

¹² http://www.aog-usafa.org/Article%20Archive/Academy_%20Agenda_for_Change.html

Athletics Changes

- The Director of Athletics will report to the Commandant of Cadets
- Those engaged in intercollegiate athletics will be required to engage in military and leadership training equivalent to their classmates.
- Off-season athletes will be required to participate in squadron activities.

Air Officer Commanding Changes

- AOC (Air Officer Commanding: the USAFA Company Officer equivalent who are in charge of the daily regimes of cadets) will be specially selected and academically prepared with a one year graduate program resulting in a Masters Degree in counseling prior to their two-year tour as an AOC.
- All AOCs will be Majors or Major selects.
- AOCs will be commanders and will be so designated on G-series orders. They will have Uniformed Code of Military Justice authority and responsibility commensurate with their rank.
- AOCs will be considered priority status for post USAFA assignments. More line officers will be mandated for assignment at USAFA.

Leadership and Character Development Changes

- Appropriate academic courses in leadership and character development will be made part of the core academic curriculum. The Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership will offer courses in military leadership.
- A lecture series sponsored by the Secretary of the Air Force and supported by senior Air Force leadership will emphasize the moral and ethical standards of Air Force officers.
- With the exception of those designated at the discretion of the Secretary and Chief of Staff, all graduates of the Air Force Academy will enter the Air Force as 2nd Lieutenants in the operational line at the wing level or below.
- A cadet-mentoring program will be established.¹³

2. “The Higher Standard”

Similarly, the “Higher Standard,” the 1997 Board of Visitors Report, extended specific guidance for the Naval Academy as well. Those recommendations related to this thesis were:

¹³ United States Air Force Academy, “Agenda for Change 2003.”

Military Faculty Recruitment and Qualifications

- Maintain a stable and ongoing system for attracting officers for military faculty billets.
- Institutionalize a system within the Navy to assure a steady stream of highly qualified military faculty by redefining the Navy's commitment to graduate education and the Academy.

Academy Mission

- Integrate the faculty into all aspects of the Academy's mission.

Leadership and Professional Development Changes

- Integrate, coordinate, and monitor the various components of leadership and professional development as a single system.
- Redesign the company officer position to focus more exclusively on developing the leadership and professional development capabilities of midshipmen.
- Remove the requirement for company officers to teach professional courses.¹⁴

The "Agenda for Change" for the Air Force Academy was introduced this year by the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Air Force so the progress of those recommendations remains to be seen. Conversely, the Strategic Plan of the Naval Academy, as referenced previously in this chapter, was created in 2002 and identified many of these same areas. Unfortunately, progress, especially in the areas of officer development integration and commitment to graduate education, has been inadequate at the Naval Academy considering these recommendations were made over six years ago. This lack of progress will be discussed further in Chapter VII.

F. CONCLUSION

The United States Navy and Air Force, as institutions, have established their espoused values that every service member is expected to uphold. These service values are evident in the mission and vision statements of each academy. The Navy advocates

¹⁴ "The Higher Standard: Assessing the United States Naval Academy." The Report of the Special Committee to the Board of Visitors, United States Naval Academy. June 1997.

“honor, courage, and commitment” for all of its members and that message is not lost on the members of the Brigade of Midshipmen who are all prepared “morally, mentally, and physically” to meet the rigors of Navy and Marine Corps life. Similarly, the core values of the Air Force, “Integrity First, Service before Self, and Excellence in all we do,” are again emphasized in the mission and vision statements of the Cadet Wing of the Air Force Academy.

Furthermore, the strategic plans of the two service academies are in concert with the areas of emphasis outlined by the core values of the corresponding services and service schools. The “Agenda for Change” of the Air Force Academy and “The Higher Standard” of the Naval Academy Board of visitors illustrate the need for change at these two service academies. The changes addressed at the Air Force Academy were introduced a few months ago so their progress can not be fully gauged. Conversely, the areas for improvement of the Naval Academy are over six years old and many, especially in the area of officer development, have not been attained or have been curtailed as a matter of priority. The next chapter describes current leadership theory, and the concept of a profession introduced by Samuel Huntington in his book, *Soldier and the State* and expounded upon by James Burk in his article, *Expertise, Jurisdiction, and Legitimacy in the Military Profession*.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. THE MILITARY PROFESSION

We must study politics and leadership and war and peace that our sons and daughters have the liberty to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, and naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children the right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry, and porcelain

-John Adams

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the concept of a profession introduced by Samuel Huntington in his book *Soldier and Soldier* (1957) and expounded upon by James Burk in his article, *Expertise, Jurisdiction, and Legitimacy in the Military Profession* (2002), and its relationship to current leadership theory. The researcher considers the theories selected to be representative of the current literature concerning leadership and character development. The study focuses on transformational and visionary leadership (James MacGregor Burns, 1978; Max Depree, 1989; John C. Maxwell, 1998; and Col Arthur Athens, USMC (ret), 2003), moral leadership (James MacGregor Burns, 1978; Vice Admiral James B. Stockdale, USN (ret), 1984; Max Depree, 1989; and John C. Maxwell, 1998), and personal mastery (Vice Admiral James B. Stockdale, 1984; Max Depree, 1989; Peter M. Senge, 1990; and John C. Maxwell, 1998).

B. CONCEPT OF PROFESSION

The end of the cold war has presented many questions for the American military. Its end closed a long period of legitimacy for the American military. During that era, the principle purpose of the American military was to prepare to fight and win our nation's wars, thus defining the occupation of the professional military officer (James Burk, 2002). With the end of the Cold War, and the advent of the War on Terrorism, the concept of the professional military has come into question. For the purpose of this study, the researcher refers to James Burk's definition of a profession to provide a common understanding of the elements involved. A profession is "a relatively high status" occupation whose members apply abstract knowledge to solve problems in a

particular field of endeavor” (Burk, p. 21). The definition identifies three key elements that are expanded upon by the researcher here to describe current leadership theory.

The three elements critical to the concept of a profession are legitimacy, jurisdiction, and expertise. First, legitimacy, or ‘high status,’ according to Burk (2002), is derived more from the work done than from the social standing of the worker (Burk, p. 21). Therefore, in order to ensure the quality of service, professionals organize themselves into associations. Professional associations guarantee the technical competence of their members by controlling their training and testing their ability. Professional associations impose a code of ethics that puts the needs of clients in first place. It is this elevation of service and the creation of organizational values that promotes the military as a profession.

Jurisdiction for problem solving was the second element in Burk’s definition of a profession. Jurisdiction is the span of control of an organization. As a result, professions are involved in competition to secure their place in society. This competition is best evidenced by the constant struggle within the American armed forces for money and missions highlighted by the securing of an enemy airfield in Afghanistan by the Marine Corps, which has always been in the Army Airborne’s job description (McCausland, 2003). According to Burk (2002), the most important factor for gaining and maintaining control over a jurisdiction “is demonstration that the professional activity succeeds, that it solves the problems it confronts” (Burk, p. 23).

The final element in Burk’s definition of a profession is applied abstract knowledge, the source of expertise, (Burk, p. 21). All professionals have been instructed in and mastered some body of knowledge to gain entry into their professional area of expertise by usually in the form of higher education. In the case of this study, higher education took the form of the leadership and character development programs at United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy. The following sections examine the relationship between Burk’s definition of a profession and current leadership theory.

C. LEGITIMACY AND TRANSFORMATIONAL/VISIONARY LEADERSHIP:

James Burk (2002) identified three prescriptive factors that, when linked together, mark an occupation as a profession. The first of these elements is legitimacy, which Burk (2002) referred to as work that maintained a “high status.” Burk related the work of British sociologist, T. H. Marshall, to his explanation of legitimacy. According to T. H. Marshall (1939) and Burk (2002), “the idea of service becoming more important than the idea of freedom” (Burk, p. 21) is the essence of legitimacy for a profession. This elevation of service before self corresponds with the ideas of transformational and visionary leadership as described by James MacGregor Burns (1978), Max Depree (1989), John H. Maxwell (1989), and Colonel Athens (2003), and the core values of the Navy and Air Force and their associated service academies.

Leadership, ideas about leadership, and leadership practices have been the focal point of a lot of writing, discussions, schools of thought, and learning. Transformational leadership, as defined by James MacGregor Burns (1978), is the process of building a “relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (p. 4). To build such a relationship it is essential for leaders to recognize and exploit an existing need or demand of a potential follower. Beyond looking at needs or demands, a transformational leader looks for personal motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower (Burns, 1978). The resultant stimulation Burns (1978) speaks of corresponds directly to the elevation of service before self identified by Marshall (1939) and Burk (2002).

Max Depree (1989), author of the book *Leadership is an Art*, identified the need for leaders to be concerned with the institutional value system of an organization, which led to the principles and standards that guide the practices of the individuals within the organization. He also insisted on a leader’s need to identify, develop, and nurture future leaders (Depree, p. 14). Furthermore, Depree promoted the idea of a leader being responsible for providing and maintaining organizational momentum. This concept of momentum comes from a “clear vision of what the corporation (or organization) ought to be (Depree, p. 18),” from a well-thought out strategy to achieve such a desired result, and

from carefully planned and communicated directions and plans that enable everyone to participate and be “publicly accountable in achieving those plans” for the future (Depree, p. 18). These ideas of an institutional value system, the development of future leaders, and providing momentum to the organization all promote the legitimacy of an occupation.

John C. Maxwell (1998) author of *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership*, introduced two laws that were applicable to the idea of service before self and providing an organization with a vision for the future. In his first law, the Law of Navigation, Maxwell (1998) talked about the need for a leader to “chart the course” of the organization (Maxwell, p. 33). To properly chart a course for an organization, Maxwell (1998) insisted on the need for leaders to understand and appreciate the needs of their followers. Maxwell (1998) identified four key elements for success in his discussion on the Law of Navigation.

First, for leaders to be successful in navigating an organization, they must rely on past experiences and learn from their mistakes and successes. Second, they must listen to what others have to say and rely on other expert knowledge. Next, leaders need to examine the conditions (of a situation) before making commitments and count the cost before making commitments for themselves or others. Finally, leaders must make certain their conclusions represent both faith and fact.

Maxwell (1998) admits that it is difficult balancing optimism and realism, intuition and planning, faith and fact, but that is what it takes to be an effective leader (Maxwell, p. 37 – 39). The act of balancing the priorities of the organization and planning for the future is an art and takes practice but in the end it provides additional legitimacy to an organization (Maxwell, 1998).

Maxwell’s (1998) Law of Sacrifice explains the price of leadership and how sacrifice, personal sacrifice, is a constant in leadership. Personal sacrifice is an on-going process, not a one-time payment (Maxwell, p. 188). According to Maxwell (1998), leaders have to give up certain rights and gain certain responsibilities to move up in an organization and that’s true of every leader regardless of profession (Maxwell, p. 190). The Law of Sacrifice demands that the greater the leader, the more they have to give up

(Maxwell, p. 191). The higher level of leadership an individual wants to achieve, the greater the sacrifice one will have to make (Maxwell, p. 192) and this idea of self-sacrifice is directly in line with the ideas presented by Marshall (1939) and Burk (2002) concerning service before self.

Colonel Arthur Athens, USMC (ret), Commandant of Midshipmen at Kings Point spoke about visionary leadership during the 2003 National Maritime Leadership Conference at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York. Athens looked at visionary leadership as sight versus vision, “seeing what things are versus what things could be (Athens, 2003).” He identified six essential elements of visionary leadership. The first element for a leader is to establish a vision, the direction, of an organization. This task of vision creation cannot be delegated and it must tie the past, present, and future together to be successful (Athens, 2003). The second step for a visionary leader is to communicate to the organization through stories, personal example, and metaphors. The vision of the organization, according to Athens, must be continually communicated in order to be successful. The third step in this process of visionary leadership is living the vision. Actions of a leader always speak louder than words. The life of a leader has to communicate the vision of the organization (Athens, 2003). The fourth step is resourcing the vision, setting priorities, and protecting the people who will execute the vision. The fifth step is pursuing the vision with a hundred and ten percent effort. An all-out effort is needed because people don’t like change (Athens, 2003). The final step in this process is to monitor the progress of the vision and the organization. It is imperative for an organization to learn continuously and for a leader to provide course corrections to achieve the vision of the organization. The idea of visionary leadership and living the organization’s vision in the daily life of the leader epitomizes the concept of service before self. Understanding the needs of the organization and prioritizing the needs and people of the organization to pursue a vision is the essence of leadership and only adds to the legitimacy of an organization.

Burk (2002) spoke about the idea of legitimacy relating to the concept of service before self, which directly relates to the ideas presented by Burns (1978), Depree (1989), Maxwell (1998) and Athens (2003) concerning transformational and visionary leadership. Furthermore, General Ridgeway spoke about the element of character being essential in

the leadership of the profession of arms. Being able to provide a common goal and direction for an organization is the cornerstone of transformational and visionary leadership. Balancing optimism and realism, intuition and planning, faith and fact, and making personal sacrifices for the organization are a function of leader's character. Both, legitimacy and character, add to the legitimacy of a leader and the legitimacy of an organization.

D. JURISDICTION AND MORAL LEADERSHIP

The second element to a profession is jurisdiction or control. James Burk admits that professional standing requires control over a domain of social life, a jurisdiction, within which members of a given profession try to solve problems (Burk, p. 23). Control over a jurisdiction is often contested and, as a result, professions are involved in competition to secure their place in society. This idea of competition is especially evident due to the end of the Cold War, the on-going War on Terrorism, currently involving American forces. The end of the Cold War has eliminated a single, pronounced enemy for the United States, and in its place, has injected small enemy factions around the globe from Bosnia to Kosovo to Central Africa to Iraq, that have required American intervention. As a result, American forces have undergone a transformation of sorts to combat this new terrorist threat. It is this transformation, moving from a continental force centered around conflict in Europe and the Greenland-Iceland-United Kingdom gap to an expeditionary force capable of worldwide response, that has led to jurisdiction disputes among the four services (McCausland, 2003). The span of control of the United States and each of its armed services is greater today than it has been in the past. As a result the 'jurisdiction' of our young officers and enlisted personnel is also greater which necessitates the emphasis on moral leadership because of the split second ethical decisions they will have to make in today's ever-changing, ever-decreasing world

According to Burk (2002), "the most important factor for gaining and maintaining control over a jurisdiction is demonstration that the professional activity succeeds, that it solves the problems it confronts" (Burk, p. 23). The ability to solve difficult problems

and understanding right from wrong in the confusing landscape of today's world is through moral leadership because of the decisions young leaders, both in the military profession and in business, have to make on a daily basis.

James MacGregor Burns (1978) defines moral leadership in three ways. First, moral leadership contains "leaders and led having a relationship not only of power but of mutual needs, aspirations, and values"(Burns, p. 4). Second, followers have adequate knowledge of alternative leaders and programs and the capacity to choose among those alternatives. Third, moral leadership is about leaders taking responsibility for their commitments (Burns, p. 4). Moral leadership, similar to Colonel Atkin's explanation of visionary leadership, is not merely preaching, it emerges from and returns to, the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers (Burns, p.4). This understanding of the wants and needs of an organization and its members is a key to successful leadership. Similarly, the satisfaction of these needs allows for easier decision-making when faced with the harder right. Finally, in the current geo-political landscape, leaders must take responsibility for their commitments. By taking on this responsibility, similar to the concept of service before self mentioned earlier, decisions between right and wrong become more readily apparent. Legitimacy and jurisdiction demand a moral foundation for a profession to be successful.

Vice Admiral Stockdale, USN (ret) in his article for the *American Educator*, Winter 1981, wrote a piece entitled *Principles of Leadership* and two of his principles spoke to this idea of moral leadership. The first principle, "You are your brother's keeper," explained the desire of individuals to improve one's personal position by thinking only about themselves. Stockdale (1984) advocated that to obtain greater good for an individual and one's companions, "the key to happiness, self respect, and survival, lies in submerging your individual instincts for self-preservation in the greater common denominator [of one's jurisdiction]" (Stockdale, p. 118). Furthermore, Stockdale (1984) quoted the Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt, by saying. "Honor is often what remains after faith, love, and hope are lost" (Stockdale, p. 118). This idea concerning personal honor speaks to the idea of high status and legitimacy.

Principle Ten of Stockdale's writing, "Moral Responsibility Cannot be Escaped," also spoke about the moral obligations of a professional. Stockdale stated "whether you are a geneticist trying to unlock the secrets of life and its creation or a bureaucrat attempting to manipulate a nation's view of itself—pro or con—you cannot use your profession as a shield from responsibility" (Stockdale, p. 120). A person, according to Stockdale (1984), is "the sum of his deeds, and the responsibility for them rests squarely on his own shoulders" (Stockdale, p. 120). The key to good leadership is, first, a clear and concise idea of right and wrong and the integrity to stand behind your assessment of any situation (Stockdale, 1984). This understanding of the greater good, similar to the idea of legitimacy advocated by Marshall (1939) and the emphasis on personal honor allows a leader to make the hard decisions they will be faced with in today's fast-paced climate in the War on Terrorism.

Max Depree (1989) also advocated moral leadership. According to Depree (1989), "leaders owe a covenant to the corporation or institution" (Depree, p. 15) they are involved with. Leaders owe the organization a new reference point for what "caring purposeful, committed people can be in the institutional setting (Depree, p. 15). These covenants bind the organization and its people together and enable them to meet their needs by meeting the needs of one another. Depree (1989) further expresses the concept of moral leadership by emphasizing the need for leaders "take a role in developing, expressing, and defending civility and values" (Depree, p. 21). In doing so, a civilized institution is created that understands the difference between right and wrong and has a value system consonant with that idea.

John C. Maxwell (1998) spoke about moral leadership in his Law of Connection. According to Maxwell (1998), effective leaders need to understand the values of their subordinates to be effective. A leader must understand and appreciate the values and cause of his followers before his subordinates will promptly act of his behalf. This concept of emotion is directly linked with visionary and transformational leadership because it relies on the leader's direction and guidance to elevate an individual's understanding of his stake in the organization and the overall mission. The stronger the connection between individuals within an organization, the more likely followers will want to help the leader achieve the vision of the organization (Maxwell, 1998). The key

to connecting with others is recognizing their individual needs. Maxwell (1989) believes successful leaders always take the initiative and take the first step with others and then make the effort to continue building relationships. Similar to making the hard choices between right and wrong that Stockdale (1984) spoke of, Maxwell (1998) advocated never underestimating the power of building relationships with people before asking them to follow you. The tougher the challenge, the greater the connection has to be between the leader and follower to overcome that given obstacle.

Burk (2002) spoke about the concept of jurisdiction—span of control—in determining whether an occupation is a profession. In today’s military profession, due to advent of increased technology and the nature of war, a “strategic corporal,” has been created. Thus, younger officers and enlisted personnel are now in control of people and situations with the potential for making moral decisions. These moral judgments are then held up to a global audience by the media. As a result, understanding the difference between moral and immoral acts, and the differences between right and wrong, are now more pertinent than ever before. The current War in Iraq and the associated media coverage has provided countless opportunities for the decisions of combat commanders to be second guessed by others. It is moral leadership and character, and understanding the difference between right and wrong, which will allow American combat commanders to be judged positively.

E. EXPERTISE AND PERSONAL MASTERY

The final element to a profession, according to Burk (2002), is mastery of abstract knowledge, which occurs through a system of higher education (Burk, p. 23). He acknowledged that professionals apply abstract knowledge to solve social problems and that all professionals have been instructed in and sought mastery of a body of knowledge. Their entry into professional practice is predicated on receiving some form of higher education (Burk, p. 22). But the form of abstract knowledge varies by profession and within professions over time. This variation in the form of knowledge or expertise is important because it affects the social standing or legitimacy of a profession among other professionals and nonprofessional occupations (Burk, p. 22) as evidenced by the disparity between the level of respect granted to Supreme Court justices, district attorneys, and

public defenders in the American justice system. It can be argued that the desire for professional expertise and abstract knowledge was a major catalyst behind the creation of our nation's service academies. Furthermore, with increased technological advances and a more elusive enemy, expertise in the profession of arms is a necessity.

According to Stockdale (1984), the role of a leader is five-fold, one must be a moralist, jurist, teacher, steward, and philosopher. All of these are separate roles a leader must perform at varying times but the one most aligned with competence is the role of teacher. Stockdale describes this role as being able to "give those around you a sense of perspective and to set the moral, social, and motivational climate among your followers" (Stockdale, p. 121). This is not an easy task because it "takes wisdom and discipline and requires both the sensitivity to perceive philosophic disarray in your charges and the knowledge of how to put things in order" (Stockdale, p. 121). To be a truly successful teacher-leader, one must aspire to "a strength, compassion, and a conviction" higher than that required by society. These ideas of wisdom and knowledge are all part of personal mastery. Furthermore, the ideas about aspirations of strength, compassion and conviction relate very well to the ideas introduced in the preceding sections on moral and transformational leadership.

Similarly, Max Depree (1989) defines "the first responsibility of a leader is to define reality" (Depree, p. 11). It is this notion of defining reality that adds to the legitimacy and jurisdiction of a profession because, by defining reality, leaders more fully understand their role within the organization. Depree's final responsibility is to say "thank you" and in between those two, a leader must become a servant to his followers. Depree defines leadership as "a concept of owing certain things to the institution" (Depree, p. 12). It is a way of thinking about institutional heirs, and "of thinking about stewardship rather than ownership" (Depree, p. 12). It is this idea of stewardship, of developing future leaders within an organization, which leads to institutional expertise and personal mastery. This idea of institutional heirs is a key to the longevity of institutional effectiveness.

Peter M. Senge goes to great lengths to describe and explain personal mastery and its effect on creating a learning organization. In his book, *The Fifth Discipline*,

Senge (1990) established personal mastery as one of his five tenets of a learning organization. According to Senge (1990), personal mastery is “the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening one’s personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing relatively objectively” (Senge, p. 7). Senge views personal mastery “as the cornerstone of a learning organization” (Senge, p. 7). It must always be remembered that embarking on any path of personal growth is a matter of choice and no one can be forced to develop his or her personal mastery.

The ideas presented by Senge concerning personal mastery are directly in concert with the ideas associated with competence and expertise (Senge, p. 141). To foster personal mastery in one’s organization it is necessary to foster a climate in which the principles of personal mastery are practiced. That means building an organization where it is safe for people to create visions, where inquiry and commitment to truth are the norm, and where challenging the status quo is expected. Such an organizational climate will strengthen personal mastery in two ways. First, it will continually reinforce the idea that personal growth is truly valued in the organization. Second, it will provide “on the job training” that is vital to developing personal mastery. As with any discipline, personal mastery must become a continual, ongoing process. The core leadership strategy in personal mastery is simple, a leader has to be the model for the organization to emulate. Talking about personal mastery may open people’s minds somewhat, but actions always speak louder than words. For a leader there is nothing more powerful to encourage others in their quest for personal mastery than to be serious in your own quest (Senge, 172). The ideas presented by Senge (1990) further emphasize the ideas already presented in terms of transformational and visionary leadership by providing the personal example for one’s followers. Furthermore, by promoting personal mastery and providing the personal example for an organization, a leader is furthering the legitimacy of the institution.

John C. Maxwell (1998) presented a law that talked to the idea of personal mastery. The Law of E. F. Hutton, being able to identify the skills and abilities of one’s followers and allowing those individuals to be heard and understood, is essential to personal mastery and expertise. Maxwell (1998) insisted that the “real test of leadership isn’t where you start out. It is where you end up (Maxwell, p. 48).” This idea of a

journey also emphasizes the ideas associated with transformational and visionary leadership in terms of providing an overarching vision for an organization.

In the Law of E. F. Hutton, Maxwell (1998) described the process of leadership development in seven fundamental steps. First, leaders need character because true leadership begins with the inner person. Second, leaders can only lead if they have followers, and that always requires the development and maintenance of relationships. Third, information is vital to a leader because an understanding of the factors involved is necessary to create a vision for the future. Fourth, leadership requires more than just a command of information. A leader needs to know how to deal with numerous intangibles and use his intuition. Fifth, the experience and challenges a leader faced, will provide credibility. The key is to have learned from one's past successes or failures as Maxwell (1998) expressed in his Law of Navigation. Sixth, a good track record speaks volumes to followers. Finally, ability, personal mastery, is the bottom line for followers. Ultimately, according to Maxwell (1998), personal mastery is the reason people will listen to leaders and acknowledge their position.

F. CONCLUSION

Burk (2002) advocated the three elements necessary for an occupation to be deemed a profession: legitimacy, jurisdiction, and expertise. These ideas of legitimacy, jurisdiction, and expertise were related to current leadership theories of Burns (1979), Stockdale (1984), Dupree (1989), Maxwell (1998) and Athens (2003). The following chapter provides an overview of the leadership education and character development programs at the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy and discusses the similarities and differences of the programs.

IV. LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

A. INTRODUCTION

The United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy are both recognized and oriented to produce graduates of character who are ready and able to lead the nation as evidenced by their vision and mission statements and core values. This chapter provides an overview of the core leadership/management courses offered and mandated at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the similarities and differences of the leadership and character development programs of the respective service academies.

B. LEADERSHIP/ETHICS CORE COURSES AT USNA

The United States Naval Academy offers two core leadership courses and one core ethics course. The leadership courses are offered during Plebe (freshman) year and Second-Class (junior) year. The required ethics course is offered during Youngster (sophomore) year. The following are course descriptions for the required leadership and ethics courses:

1. NL112: *Leadership and Human Behavior* (2 Credits): Is designed to provide a basic understanding of human development, personality traits and styles, principles of followership, cognitive functioning and memory, learning principles, stress and stress management, motivation, social influences and basic interpersonal and self-management skills. NL112 is designed to emphasize the leadership applications of critical concepts in human behavior to make more effective leaders in the United States Navy. NL112 is a required course for all freshman during their fall semester (<http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/nl112/index.htm>).

2. NE203: *Moral Reasoning for Naval Leaders* (3 credits): is designed to present a case study-oriented approach to the presentation of the course material, one that parallels standard approaches to teaching ethics in the professions generally (such as medicine, law, and business). NE203 offers midshipmen, as officers-in-training, the opportunity to acquaint themselves with, and to reflect at length upon the heritage, cherished traditions, and high moral calling of the military profession they have chosen to enter. NE203 is taught to approximately one half of all sophomore midshipmen during the fall semester, and to the remaining half of the class during the spring. (<http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/ne203/index.htm>).

3. NL302: *Leadership Theory and Application* (2 Credits): This is the second of the two core leadership courses that provide the academic foundation of the four-year continuum of leadership development at the Naval Academy. This course builds on the theories and concepts presented in NL112, which examined leadership from a values approach (Naval Service Core Values), a systems approach (Chain of Command), a functional approach (Leadership Triad), and a skills approach (motivation, supervision, communication, etc).

Continuing this progression, NL302 takes a process approach, defining leadership as the process of influencing an organized group to achieve its goals. This course stresses learner-centered processes, such as collaboration, peer teaching and evaluation, experiential exercises, reflective writing, and group discussion, which promote life-long learning skills. This learning system is used to examine the leadership process in context of the dynamic interaction of the leader, the follower, and the situation.

Case study discussions are sequenced throughout the course to illustrate the relevance of key concepts presented in preceding sessions and relate these ideas to the Fleet environment.

NL302 is a required course for all junior midshipmen during their spring semester (<http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/nl302/index.htm>).

C. LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT/ETHICS CORE COURSES OFFERED AT USAFA

The United States Air Force Academy offers two core management courses and one core ethics course. The management courses are offered during freshman and junior year. The required ethics course is offered during the sophomore year. The following are course descriptions of the required management and ethics courses:

1. Beh Sci 110: *An Introduction to Behavioral Science and Leadership* (3 Credits): this course provides an introduction to the scientific study of human behavior at the individual level, addresses fundamental knowledge about living and working in small groups (such as families or military units), and introduces the student to sociology and anthropological perspectives on the structure and function of larger social groups. The course also provides an introduction to the study of leadership with particular emphasis on multiple perspectives for analyzing situations so cadets can better understand and enhance individual and group performance. The course makes extensive use of experiential exercises that reinforce psychological principles and leadership skills that complement basic concepts. Beh Sci 110 is required for all freshman cadets (United States Air Force Academy 2002 Curriculum Handbook, p. 196).

2. Philos 310: **Ethics** (3 credits): A critical study of several major moral theories and their application to contemporary moral problems with special emphasis on the moral problems of the profession of arms. Philos 310 is required for all sophomore cadets (United States Air Force Academy 2002 Curriculum Handbook, p. 281)

3. Management 200: *Introduction to Management* (2 credits): This course focuses on universality of the management functions of leading, planning, organizing, and controlling an organization so as to efficiently and effectively reach its objectives. Through a survey of critical management topics, cadets learn to use management functions to analyze and improve organizations and their processes in increasingly complex, ambiguous, and dynamic environments. MGT 200 helps students develop the adaptive capacity required to manage an organizations' resources –ideas, people,

equipment, finances, and information. Other topics include decision-making, ethical and social responsibilities of organizations, information systems, and personal financial planning for Air Force officers. Management is offered to all junior year cadets (United States Air Force Academy 2002 Curriculum Handbook, p. 257).

D. CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AT USNA/USAF

Both the United States Naval Academy and Air Force Academy maintain character development programs to aid in the moral development of midshipmen and cadets. Each program is designed as a process that builds on the lessons learned during the previous year's lessons. This section provides an overview of the character development programs offered at USNA and USAFA.

The United States Naval Academy, similar to the United States Air Force Academy, maintains a four-year character development continuum that is in concert with the leadership continuum. At the Naval Academy, this model follows the progression of follower, mentor, trainer, leader and is aligned with the core values of the Naval Service, while the Air Force Academy follows the personal, interpersonal, team, and organization (PITO) model, and is also aligned with the core values of the Air Force. To achieve this process, the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy offer the following character development programs:

1. Fourth-Class Year:

a. USNA: 4/C Leader of Character Seminars – Honor

Honor and Courage are analyzed in the study of strong historical characters. *Henry V* is utilized during Plebe year. The basis is the Shakespeare play, *Henry V*, and supplemented by the movie of the same name. This study is conducted in four discussion sessions spread throughout the academic year

(http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/seminars/4c_seminars.html).

b. USAFA: VECTOR-- Vital Effective Character Through Observation and Reflection

Purpose, vision, values, influence are analyzed in the study of the strong characters during the American Civil War that focuses on self-reflection. The movie *Glory* is utilized during 4th Degree year to illustrate to fourth-class cadets the importance of developing a strong personal foundation while further examining their own leadership styles. This study is conducted during a three-hour interactive seminar (United States Air Force Academy Vector Facilitator Guide, 2003).

2. Third-Class Year:

a. USNA: 3/C Leader of Character Seminars – Courage:

This seminar series is built upon the lessons learned during the Honor series provided during fourth-class year. After the study of *Henry V* is completed in Plebe Year, the character study shifts to Sir Thomas More. This analysis is also based on a play and the movie, "A Man for All Seasons." This study is conducted in four discussion sessions spread throughout the academic year (http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/seminars/3c_seminars.html).

b. USAFA: Respect and Responsibility (R & R) Workshops:

This seminar is an experiential learning experience that stresses the importance of positive interpersonal relations. Third class cadets attempt a graduated series of activities, involving both emotional and physical risk, exploring the issues of values, trust, communication, and diversity.

This study is conducted during a four-hour experiential learning seminar (United States Air Force Academy Vector Facilitator Guide, 2003).

3. Second-Class Year:

a. USNA: 2/C Character Development Seminars: Commitment Enrichment

This seminar is the third installment of a continuing effort to underscore the Core Values of honor, courage, and commitment by focusing on commitment and the application of this value in the Midshipmen's lives today and as future leaders in our Navy and Marine Corps. This format allows them the opportunity to assess their strengths and weaknesses and develop a set of personal and professional goals in an interactive format. The self-reflection will occur while observing and analyzing a specific character in one of three movies, *U571*, *Glory* or *We Were Soldiers*. Upon completion of this seminar, midshipmen will have completed what amounts to a life mission statement. Each 2/C Midshipman attends a four hour-long seminar, in the evening from 1600 to 2000. The seminars are scheduled throughout the year, and each Midshipman is free to choose which day he or she attends (http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/seminars/2c_seminars.html).

b. .USAFA: LIFT-- Leaders in Flight Today:

This seminar is intended for 2/C cadets to better understand individual personality contributions to high performance team formation. Second-class cadets employ experiential learning and case study techniques to improve effective communication, interpersonal skills, positive motivation, and team leadership accountability. This study is conducted during an eight-hour off-site seminar (United States Air Force Academy Vector Facilitator Guide, 2003).

4. First-Class Year:

a. USNA: 1/C Capstone Character Excellence Seminars:

This seminar provides a continuing effort to underscore the core values of honor, courage, and commitment and the application of these values as future leaders in the Navy and Marine Corps. Each 1/C Midshipmen attends the seminar in civilian business dress. The seminars are scheduled

throughout the academic year and 1/C midshipmen are free to choose when he or she attends. This study is conducted during a day-long off-site seminar

(http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/Capstone/capstone_index.html).

b. USAFA: Capstone: Eagle Aces

This seminar is designed to focus attendees on the ethical demands placed on Air Force Officers. First-class cadets are exposed to issues, concepts, and experiences which convey the importance of character and leadership development. This study is conducted during an eight-hour off-site seminar (United States Air Force Academy Vector Facilitator Guide, 2003).

The character development programs at the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy are very similar to one another and are both in concert with the leadership development model of each institution. These programs also reinforce the missions of the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy by providing for the moral development of the midshipmen and cadets. It is this moral development, the concepts of commitment, service before self, and moral leadership, that defines military service as a profession.

E. CONCLUSION

The core leadership, management, and ethics courses of each institution were described to provide a basis for comparison with each other in this chapter, and later for comparison with the data collected for this study, which are presented in Chapter VI. An overview of the character development program of each institution was provided to illustrate the commonalities of both programs and how they related to the leadership continuum and core values of both academies.

In terms of commonalities, the leadership/ethics education programs, as far as a class year, are similar in design. NL112 and Beh Sci 110 are both offered during a midshipman's/cadet's freshmen year. Similarly, the required ethics course is offered during sophomore year, and NL302 and Management 200 are offered during junior year. This sequence of courses provides for a natural progression of leadership and management theory to develop during a midshipmen/cadet four-year experience. Furthermore, the character development programs at each institution are closely aligned with their associated leadership models. This association is due to the close interaction of the senior leadership of the leadership and character development departments at the Naval Academy and the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership and the Center for Character Development at the Air Force Academy.

As with the leadership and ethics instruction, the character development programs at Navy and Air Force, provide a four-year development process. At Navy, there is a focus on transforming a midshipman from a follower to a leader with honor, courage, and commitment who can apply those ideals to every day decision making. Similarly, Air Force focuses on a transformation from focusing on the personal aspect of a cadet, all the way to presenting ideas concerning the entire Air Force organization and the dilemmas and decision-making at the organizational level. The Capstone Character Development programs are quite similar, both are eight-hour, off-site seminars focusing on service core values and the issues and experiences of the Fleet and the Air Force.

In contrast, the Naval Academy has two core leadership courses equating to four credit hours over two semesters. The Air Force Academy maintains two management courses equating to five credit hours over two semesters and only seven leadership lessons are taught in Beh Sci 110. The character development programs are similar in design but not in scope. The freshman program at Air Force utilizes the movie *Glory*, to emphasize purpose, vision, values, and influence, while Navy uses the movie *Henry V*, to emphasize honor and courage. Air Force allocates one three-hour interactive seminar with use of facilitators while Navy allocates four one-hour sessions utilizing company officers and senior enlisted as moderators. The sophomore program at Navy utilizes *A Man for All Seasons* to emphasize moral courage during four one-hour sessions while Air Force incorporates a four-hour experiential learning seminar to stress the importance of

positive interpersonal relations. The junior year program at Navy uses three movies, *U571*, *Glory*, or *We Were Soldiers*, to promote self reflection and introspection while focusing on commitment and the application of this value in everyday life. The Naval Academy allocates a four-hour seminar in the evening for this program. The Air Force Academy allocates an eight-hour off-site seminar for their juniors to better understand individual personality contributions to high performance team formation.

The leadership and character development programs at the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy are quite similar with the exception of the core leadership/management courses. Both emphasize the core values of their respective services and are in concert with the leadership development model of each institution. However, the core courses at the Naval Academy, NL112 and NL302, place more of an emphasis on leadership theory and application, while the core curriculum of the Air Force Academy, Beh Sci 110 and Management 200, advocates management principles. Conversely, although the Naval Academy core curriculum stresses leadership education, by maintaining two core leadership courses, the Air Force Academy advocates the importance of management skills by mandating a three-credit and two-credit-course, whereas the Naval Academy only mandates two two-credit courses. This lack of academic importance, only mandating a two-credit course during the freshman and junior years of the Naval Academy four-year experience as compared to the other academic disciplines, is discussed in Chapter VI.

Both programs also reinforce the missions of the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy by providing for the leadership and moral development of midshipmen and cadets. The following chapter describes the research methods and procedures used to obtain and analyze the data collected for this study.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. METHOD AND PROCEDURE

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the research methods and procedures used to obtain and analyze the data within this study. The primary reason the researcher chose a qualitative analysis method was due to the nature of the topic. An assessment of service academy officer development is a very difficult subject to measure from a quantitative perspective as so much of it revolves around human factors and intangible results. Trying to quantify leadership and character development is a daunting if not impossible task.

This is especially true when looking at the service academy officer development programs at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy. While it is possible to track the performance of midshipmen and cadets via numerous quantitative means such as grade point average, military standing, and physical readiness scores, which is done to identify order of merit and class standing, it is not possible to quantify leadership or character development. In other words, as seen in the numerous approaches to leadership mentioned previously, there is no one special method to assess the leadership or character development of a cadet or midshipmen. Parallels can be drawn based on past performance, but how well an individual cadet or midshipmen will conduct themselves in the Fleet, Fleet Marine Force, or the Air Force, cannot be fully known until they get there and are evaluated by their superiors under ‘real-world’ conditions instead of the ‘leadership laboratory’ atmosphere of a service academy.

B. ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

Before describing the methodology, it is important to explain the role that the researcher had in the study. The researcher is a 1996 Naval Academy graduate who has been stationed at the United States Naval Academy as part of the Leadership, Ethics, and Law Department since November of 2000. Prior to being stationed at Annapolis, the researcher spent forty-six months on sea duty aboard a SPRUANCE-class destroyer. Additionally, the researcher was enrolled in the Leadership, Education, and Development

(LEAD) Program at the United States Naval Academy and completed this study as part of the requirements for graduation from the program. The LEAD program is normally the forerunner to a two-year tour as a Company Officer, but the program also applies to one Leadership instructor per year. As a result, as a member of the Leadership faculty at the United States Naval Academy, the conduct and results of this study were of great importance to the researcher. The researcher conducted this study in an effort to determine the differences and similarities in the approaches to Officer Development at the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy. Officer development, specifically leadership and character development, were assessed to provide a better understanding for future Leadership faculty and to provide recommendations for possible improvements. The personal stake the researcher had in the findings of this study only increased the breadth and depth of the research.

C. DATA COLLECTION

The primary means of collecting the data necessary for this study was a series of interviews, focus groups, and telephone and email surveys conducted by the researcher. Interviews were conducted with key Naval Academy and Air Force Academy staff and faculty to gain a better understanding of the leadership and character development programs. The directors of Professional Development (PRODEV), Character Development (CHARDEV), Leadership, Ethics and Law (LEL), and the Leadership Directorate at the Naval Academy and the directors of the Department for Behavioral Sciences and Leadership (DFBL), the Character and Leadership Division within the Center for Character Development, and the Leadership Directorate at the Air Force were interviewed to provide a senior level perspective on leadership and character development. Fifty-percent, or 7 leadership and 3 character development, of the Naval Academy's Leadership and Character Development faculty were interviewed to include the two course coordinators for the leadership courses and the staff with the most teaching experience at USNA. Eighty-percent, or 7, of the Leadership directorate and one-hundred percent, or 6, of the Character and Leadership Division were interviewed at the Air Force Academy.

The second important element in the data collection was focus groups with service academy exchange midshipmen at the Naval Academy and email surveys with service academy exchange cadets at the Air Force Academy. These midshipmen and cadets have a unique insight into the leadership and character development programs at the Naval Academy and Air Force Academy because they spent a semester immersed at the sister service academy as part of the service academy exchange program. Fifty-percent, or 7, of each of the Naval Academy exchange midshipmen groups participated in the researcher's focus groups. Fifty-percent, or 6, of the junior year exchange cadets and thirty-three percent, or 4, of the senior year exchange cadets from the Air Force Academy participated in the researcher's email survey. After-action reports were also utilized to provide additional insight into the leadership and character development programs at USNA and USAFA.

The final part of the data collection was the incorporation of the Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. The Army War College offered senior level Naval and Air Force officers who could provide insight concerning the desired end state of officer development from our service academies. The senior Navy and Air Force service representatives of the Army War College, four senior (O-5) Navy, and two senior Air Force officers were interviewed.

The sample interviewed was divided in four groups. The first consisted of the Directors of the Leadership and Character Development programs at Navy and Air Force. The department directors are responsible for the proper implementation of institution's programs and have a senior officer perspective on leadership and character development due to their numerous leadership and command roles. The second consisted of the leadership and character development faculty and staff of the service academies. The leadership and character development faculty and staff are providing the education, training, direction, and guidance to the midshipmen and cadets so their inputs were vital. The third group is the service academy exchange midshipmen and cadets. These midshipmen and cadets spent a semester at their sister service academy and, as a result, have a keen insight into the similarities/differences and areas for improvement at each academy. Both senior and junior members of the service academy exchange program were interviewed to provide a broader population of participants. Service academy

exchange after-action reports were also examined to provide additional insight into the similarities and differences at Navy and Air Force. The final group consisted of Navy and Air Force officers from the Army War College and care was taken to include both academy and non-academy graduates.

1. Question Formulation

Four specific sets of questions were used for the senior service academy officers, the leadership and character development faculty and staff, the service academy exchange midshipmen/cadets, and the Army War College officers. These questions were developed in an effort to obtain sufficient data to answer the study's research questions. The original sets of questions were first given to leadership and character development faculty to edit and revise and then to both advisors for this study. Once the interview process began, no changes were made to any of questions.

All interviews were recorded on cassette tapes and were transcribed upon the completion of the interview. The interviews consisted of the researcher speaking only to the prescribed questions in an effort not to lead the interviewee in any direction or to draw any specific conclusions. The focus groups consisted of the researcher speaking only to the prescribed questions in a round-robin format to allow for all the group members to participate and provide feedback. Everything that was said during each of the interviews and focus groups was transcribed word for word in order to capture as much information as possible.

The researcher used two methods of note taking to aid in data collection: reflective remarks and memoing (Miles and Hunerman, p. 21). During the interviews and focus groups, the researcher took extensive notes on the answers from the interviewee in order to develop themes. This theme identification tool is known as reflective remarks. These notes were taken on a separate copy of the questions being asked, commonly referred to as a contact summary sheet (Miles and Hunerman, p. 23). The researcher also took notes during the transcription phase of each interview as well. During each interview transcription, if a theme became apparent, the researcher would create a name

for the theme and add it into the transcript in an effort to help identify trends when the data analysis was conducted. This theme identification tool is known as memoing.

2. Senior Academy Officer Interviews

On average, the senior academy officer interviews lasted between fifty-five and sixty minutes and were conducted in the officers' respective offices. The senior academy officers were asked eight specific questions focusing on leadership and character development, the strategic plans of their institutions, and reflection on their past experiences. There were also questions that attempted to draw out information that would or would not correlate with the information gathered from the leadership/character development faculty and staff interviews. These eight questions were as follows:

1. How do you define Leadership? How is Leadership learned? How do you define character? How is moral development learned? Do you think leadership and character can be taught?
2. How are the leadership and character development programs at Navy/Air Force viewed by senior officers? Faculty? Midshipmen/Cadets?
3. Reflecting on your experiences as a junior officer, do you think the Officer Development programs at Navy/Air Force adequately prepare midshipmen/cadets for their roles as junior officers? If so, how? If not, why and what can be improved upon?
4. Do you think the leadership and character development programs at Navy/Air Force should be integrated? If so, why? If not, why?
5. What is the purpose of the strategic plan in the area of officer development for the Naval/Air Force Academy? Is it effective?
6. Are the officer development programs of Navy/Air Force incorporating the most efficient and effective approaches to Leadership? Character Development?
7. Should the service academies improve the inter-service academy communication mechanism in the area of officer development?
8. Do you have any recommendations concerning possible program changes or implementation in the area of officer development at Navy/Air Force?

3. Leadership and Character Development Faculty Interviews

The leadership and character development faculty interviews were approximately forty-five minutes and were conducted in the officers' respective offices. The senior academy officers were asked seven specific questions focusing on leadership and character development, the assessment tools of their institutions, reflection on their past

experiences, and program analysis. There were also questions that attempted to draw out information that would or would not correlate with the information gathered from the senior academy officers. These seven questions were as follows:

1. How do you define Leadership? How is leadership learned? How do you define character? How can moral development be learned? Do you think leadership and character development can be taught?
2. How are the Officer Development programs, character and leadership, viewed by the faculty? The midshipmen/cadets? The administration?
3. Do you think the Officer Development programs at Navy/Air Force adequately prepare midshipmen/cadets for their role as junior officers? If so, how? If not, why and what can be improved upon?
4. Do you think the leadership and character development programs at Navy/Air Force should be integrated? If so, why? If not, why?
5. How is success or failure of the officer development programs measured and communicated to Academy staff and Midshipmen/Cadets?
6. Is USNA/USAFA encouraging and promoting introspection and self-analysis as a part of their officer development programs? If so, how? If not, why?
7. Should the service academies improve the inter-service academy communication mechanism concerning officer development? If so, how? If not, why?

4. Service Academy Exchange Midshipmen/Cadets Focus Groups and Interviews

The focus groups conducted with the Naval Academy service academy exchange midshipmen were approximately seventy minutes and were conducted in the Chesapeake Room at the United States Naval Academy. Email surveys were conducted with Air Force Academy service academy exchange cadets because of inaccessibility due to weather conditions during the researcher's visit to USAFA. The service academy exchange cadets and midshipmen were asked seven specific questions focusing on leadership and character development, their experiences at USNA and USAFA, similarities and differences in approaches to officer development; and reflection upon their service academy exchange experience. There were also questions that attempted to draw out information that would or would not correlate with the information gathered from the senior academy officers and leadership and character development faculty. These seven questions were as follows:

1. How do you define leadership? How do you think leadership is learned? How do midshipmen/cadets view the leadership programs at Navy/Air Force? Is there a difference? Why?
2. How do you define character? Can moral development be taught? If so, how? How are the character development programs at Navy/Air Force viewed by the cadets/midshipmen? The faculty?
3. Do you think the Officer Development programs at Navy/Air Force will have adequately prepared you for your role as a junior officer? If so, how? If not, why and what can be improved upon?
4. Do you think Navy/Air Force are teaching what needs to be taught in terms Leadership and Character development and success in the Fleet/Fleet Marine Force/Air Force? What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of each program?
5. How is the success or failure of the officer development programs measured and communicated to Academy staff and Midshipmen/cadets?
6. In the area of Officer Development, Leadership and Character development, what is Navy doing right? What is Air Force doing right? Should anything be changed?
7. Looking back on your experiences at both USNA and USAFA, how can we improve the officer development programs?

5. Army War College at Carlisle Senior Officer Interviews

The Army War College interviews were approximately forty-five to sixty minutes and interviews were either conducted in the respective offices of the senior officers or in one of the War College conference rooms. The Army War College officers were asked eight specific questions focusing on leadership and character development, views of the service academy programs, reflection on their past experiences, and program analysis. There were also questions that attempted to draw out information that would or would not correlate with the information gathered from the senior academy officers, leadership and character development faculty, and the service academy exchange midshipmen/cadets. These eight questions were as follows:

1. How do you define Leadership? How is Leadership learned?
2. How do you define character? How is moral development learned?
3. Do you think leadership and character can be taught?
4. How are the leadership and character development programs at your respective service academy viewed by senior officers in your respective service?
5. Reflecting on your experiences as a commanding officer, do you think the Officer Development programs at Navy/Air Force adequately prepare midshipmen/cadets

- for their roles as junior officers? If so, how? If not, why and what can be improved upon?
6. Based on your experiences as a commanding officer, do you think the leadership and character development programs at Navy/Air Force should be integrated and have the same voice and vision concerning officer development? If so, why? If not, why?
 7. There are certain qualities necessary for any military professional. Should there be more inter-service academy communication concerning the areas of Leadership and Character Development to identify those core competencies and train to them at all service academies?
 8. Based on your experiences as a commanding officer, do you have any recommendations concerning possible program changes or implementations in the area of officer development at Navy/Air Force?

As will be illustrated in the next chapter, the answers to these questions were organized around specific themes that reflect similarities, differences, and recommendations among the Army War College officers, senior academy officers, leadership and character development faculty and staff, and service academy exchange midshipmen/cadets.

D. DATA ANALYSIS

The above section clearly illustrates the shear amount of information collected for this study. In conducting content analysis of the data obtained from the interviews, the researcher used four key analysis methods. These were data reduction, coding, noting patterns and themes (or comparative analysis), and clustering. Each of these methods is described briefly in the following paragraphs.

The initial analysis method used for this study was a technique called data reduction (Miles and Hunerman, 1984). Data reduction allows the researcher to reduce the amount of information collected by identifying specific areas of research. It is also perhaps the most significant of the methods used because it begins even before the data are collected. Anticipatory data reduction occurred in the earliest stages of this study, specifically during the literature review process, and significantly influenced the researcher in formulating both the research and interview questions. Data reduction allows the researcher to create specific topics of interest for examination.

Once all of the data were obtained, it became necessary to draw parallels within the raw information. One of the most useful methods for accomplishing this is known as coding. “A code is an abbreviation or symbol applied to a segment of words – most often a sentence or paragraph of transcribed notes – in order to classify the words. Codes are categories” (Miles and Hunerman, p. 56). Initial coding was done during the interview process by taking notes in addition to the recorded interviews. When an interviewee spoke to a common topic that was facilitated by the specific interview protocol, it was given a code – often one or two words to describe it – so that it could be grouped with other like data. When the actual analysis was conducted at a later date, these codes became extremely useful for identifying data clusters.

In addition to coding, noting patterns and themes within the data is a useful means for drawing conclusions from the information collected. Noting patterns and themes is also advantageous when useful information is provided out of context to the topic being discussed. The interviewee may be discussing leadership development but will discuss character development during the discussion. Identifying patterns and themes allows the data to be coded appropriately so it may be addressed in the correct way during the analysis portion of the study.

The final method used to analyze the data obtained for this study was clustering. This method is very useful when combined with coding and themes and patterns. Coding and theme identification divide the raw information in specific groups and clustering allows the data to be broken down into categories and stored accordingly. Clustering can be done on several levels from broad over arching topics to specific pieces of useful information from various sources. Clustering allows the researcher “to understand a phenomenon better by grouping, then conceptualizing objects/facts that have similar patterns or characteristics” (Miles and Hunerman, p. 219).

E. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter provided the procedures, protocols, and methods of data collection and analysis. It discussed the interviews conducted, who was interviewed, and the importance of each interview/focus group subset. The role of the researcher and the

benefits of study were also addressed. The questions asked of the four specific groups and the background behind those questions was also illustrated. The data analysis methods used—coding, data reduction, noting patterns and themes, and clustering—were described as well as their relevance to the data collected. Now that the methods and procedures have been addressed, the next chapter describes the findings.

VI: THEMES

A. INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter described the procedures, protocols, and methods used during data collection and analysis. This chapter presents seven themes generated from the data using the methods of coding, data reduction, noting patterns and themes, and clustering discussed in Chapter V. The themes are supported with specific quotes from the midshipmen/cadets, leadership and character development instructors, senior academy departmental officers, and senior naval and air force officers at the Army War College. Although the interview data include descriptions of varied leadership experiences, good and bad leadership, character modeling, and personal leadership theories, it is important to note that the primary reason for this research is to investigate officer development at the two service academies. Each theme is divided into three sub-categories: theme, justification, and conclusion. The first section introduces the theme present in the data. The justification section provides the interview, survey, and focus group data in the form of specific quotes from participants. The final section offers the researcher's conclusions from the data collected and presented.

These varied experiences are important because they provide themes from all four interview groups. These themes can then be compared to one another to identify if similarities/differences exist between the two service academies, the two services, or among the officer ranks. The desired end result of this thesis is to provide the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy with specific information and recommendations concerning their officer development programs. As such, all seven themes focus on the process and perception of leadership and character development at the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy and can be grouped into three distinct categories: (1) leadership and character; (2) integration, cooperation, and synergy; and (3) emphasis and qualifications.

Themes I - III define and explain leadership and character: (1) leadership is about influence and motivation; (2) leadership is learned both through academics and experience; (3) character is about doing the right thing. In themes IV and V, the data

suggest (4) the need for integration between the leadership and character development departments at the service academies; and (5) the cooperation and synergy between the service academies themselves. In themes VI – VII, data advocate (6) the need for more time, credits, and emphasis to be placed on leadership education and character development; and (7) the need for more faculty and staff academic qualifications, particularly for Naval Academy leadership and character development instructors.

B. THEME I: LEADERSHIP IS ABOUT INFLUENCE

1. Theme

All four sub groups (midshipmen/cadets, leadership/character development instructors, senior academy officers, and Army War College senior service officers) defined leadership as having to do with the influence or motivation of others. This idea of influence and motivation is linked to the idea of transformational or visionary leadership discussed previously because of the ability of a leader to provide direction and guidance to his followers. Influencing and motivating followers is critical to a leader's success as described in Chapter III.

2. Justification

During the focus group sessions, email surveys, and interview sessions, the researcher asked the interviewees (midshipmen, cadets, and officers) to define leadership. The Second-Class midshipmen focus group from the Naval Academy defined leadership as “a leader's ability to get you to perform something that you not only don't want to do but to make the person actually want to do it.” One member of the First-Class midshipmen focus group defined leadership as “looking out for people and a lot of it is a leader's ability to be objective and explain things to people, hopefully, inspire them towards a goal.”

The Air Force Academy cadets expressed a similar definition of leadership as the midshipmen. Air Force Cadet A, a junior at the United States Air Force Academy who participated in the service academy exchange in the fall of 2002, defined leadership by stating, “Leadership is the skill of motivating people to accomplish or complete certain objectives.” Air Force Cadet B, a senior at the United States Air Force Academy who

participated in the service academy exchange program at the United States Naval Academy in the fall of 2001, defined leadership as, “the organization, coordination, and motivation of a group of people towards an established goal.” Air Force Cadet C, a junior at the United States Air Force Academy who participated in the service academy exchange program in the fall of 2002, defined leadership simply as “the ability to motivate others. It’s providing internal motivation to your troops.”

The data suggest similarities and differences between the two service academies in terms of the definition of leadership. USNA Instructor A, a submarine officer, defined leadership as “the ability to influence a group towards a common goal. Any definition that has the two elements of influence and development of subordinates towards a common goal or mission is how I define leadership.” Similarly, USNA Instructor B, a naval aviator, defined leadership as:

I think it does revolve around the influence of people . . . you can manage equipment, you can manage money and you can manage people to some extent but a leader is a step above that . . . you can manage people to do what they want to do but you have to lead people to do more than they want to do.

USNA instructor C, another submarine officer, involved with the Character Development Department and Honor Program, described leadership as “the art of influencing other people or groups of people to reach goals or complete tasks or objectives.” USNA instructor E, a surface warfare officer, described leadership in a similar fashion, explaining, “Leadership is the process of influencing those around you to achieve some kind of common goal, not only for the organization, but also that meets with the group’s approval.” USNA instructor H, a Marine Corps combat engineer, defined leadership simply as “a technique to change human behavior.”

The responses from the USNA instructors concerning the definition of leadership were analogous to those provided by the midshipmen and cadets. The researcher also interviewed leadership and character development instructors at USAFA and their definitions were akin to those provided by the midshipmen and cadets and the USNA instructors. USAFA instructor A, a retiree from the United States Air Force, currently in

the Character Development department, talked about leadership being “the ability to inspire those around you.” USAFA instructor C, a human factors engineer within the leadership directorate, defined leadership as “a process of leading some organized group to a goal that involves the leader, the follower, and the situation.” USAFA instructor D, a behavioral scientist who works with both the leadership and character development programs, defined leadership in two ways. First, his academic response defined leadership as the act of “influencing one or many people toward a desired outcome. If you get people to do something they were going to do already, you are not leading.” Some of his personal insights on leadership were:

Leadership, to be seen as a leader, you have to gain the respect of those who are led . . . it is a credit exchange, it is a minute-by-minute, decision-by-decision experience . . . A leader has to have competence, or perceived competence, leadership is really just the perception of a person, trust is the currency of leadership.

Air Force Academy instructors relate the three aspects of leadership, the leader, the follower, and the situation, to the concept of influence and motivation. Furthermore, the ideas presented by USAFA instructor D, (the notion of competence), related directly to the ideas revolving around the concept of the military as a profession as discussed in Chapter III.

The senior officers at the Naval Academy and Air Force Academy also defined leadership in terms of influence. Senior USAFA officer A, an O-5 (Lieutenant Colonel), defined leadership as “influencing people to achieve a common goal.” Influence being the key word. Somehow influencing people to achieve something they want to achieve together.” Similarly, senior USNA officer A, an O-6 (Captain), defined leadership simply as “motivating people to do things that they wouldn’t ordinarily do.” All of these definitions express the concept of influence being a main instrument in the art of leadership.

The final elements to this theme were the definitions provided by senior service officers at the Army War College. Senior naval officer C, a Navy O-5 (Commander), defined leadership as “influencing people to do things.” Senior naval officer D, also a Navy O-5, had a similar definition, “leadership is about influence, it’s about mentorship

and leading by example.” The senior Air Force officers, at the Army War College, defined leadership in the same way as the USNA/USAF midshipmen/cadets, the USNA instructors, and the senior academy officers. Senior Air Force officer B, an O-5 (Lieutenant Colonel), defined leadership as “using interpersonal skills and influence such as motivation, honesty, integrity, purpose, conviction . . . using these skills to accomplish a mission, a mission that is agreed upon, one that is vital, and one that is meaningful to the organization.”

3. Conclusion

The data suggest all three perspectives (midshipmen/cadet, officer, and senior officer) were in agreement in terms of influence and motivation playing major roles in the development of personal leadership. It can be inferred that this idea of influence also relies heavily on interpersonal skills that need to be honed through education and experience. In addition, the faculty at the Air Force Academy placed more emphasis on the LFS (Leader, Follower, and Situation) model than any of the other groups interviewed. This additional emphasis can be attributed to their educational backgrounds in behavioral science and human factors engineering. It can be concluded that human behavior emphasis (influence and motivation) on leadership education, and advocated by the Naval Academy Board of Visitors in 1997, provides the educational background that is consistent with the views of the Fleet. Similarly, the interpersonal skills emphasized at the Air Force Academy in their management courses and in the character development programs emphasize the views of the force.

C. THEME II: LEADERSHIP IS LEARNED BOTH THROUGH ACADEMICS AND EXPERIENCE

1. Theme

All four sub groups agreed leadership is learned through experience. The instructors, senior officers, and War College officers also emphasized the need for training and education to aid in leadership development. The three-pronged approach to leadership development (education, training, and experience) is what sets the service academies apart from other institutions that just teach leadership in the classroom and do

not have the ability to allow their student body the opportunity to ‘try-on’ different leadership styles. The three-pronged approach to leadership development can be related to the ideas presented concerning personal mastery and competence in Chapter III. Education and experience complement the training aspect of development and can capitalize on the knowledge gained during the educational and experiential phases of learning.

2. Justification

During the focus group sessions, email surveys, and interview sessions, the researcher asked the interviewees (midshipmen, cadets, and officers) to explain how leadership was learned. The midshipmen/cadet sub-group emphasized the importance of the experiential side of leadership development, but failed to put any emphasis on the educational and training levels of leadership development. The USNA/USAFA instructors, senior USNA and USAFA officers, and senior Army War College officers emphasized both the experiential side as well as the educational and training sides of the leadership development triad. These ideas mirror those found in Lieutenant Robert Kennedy’s Thesis, *Leadership Development Revisited: An assessment of midshipmen learning processes at the United States Naval Academy* (1998). The themes, II, III, IV, and VIII specifically, presented in Chapter IV of Kennedy’s thesis relate directly to the ideas presented by interview data from this study. Those themes are:

- Theme II: Midshipmen learn leadership behaviors by observing role models
- Theme III: Midshipmen learn about leadership by reflecting on their personal experiences and observations.
- Theme IV: Midshipmen learn leadership behaviors by actively experimenting with a variety of leadership styles.
- Theme VII: Graduate students and leadership instructors learn about leadership by observing others, reflecting on their personal experiences, and interacting with the formal leadership theory.

The midshipmen focus groups and cadet surveys echoed these ideas with the exception of the Theme VII. One member of the Second-Class midshipmen focus group explained the importance of role models and experience in this way:

I think that you can't necessarily teach it as much as you can learn it. I have learned more from just seeing people, seeing upper classmen commanding and how they are acting and now I am following those [role models]. I learned more from [role models] but not necessarily because I was told what to do here and there – more from exposure to role models and observation. It's the experience part.

Similarly, a midshipman in the First-Class focus group emphasized the significance of role models and experience:

I have learned more about leadership by example and observation from mentors, just watching them, seeing how they treat me and others, how they react and interact with people. I think leadership is learned by examples of others.

Likewise, another view from the First-Class midshipmen focus group:

I think it is very important to have a person you mentor with and work with. I have learned the most from actually getting my hands dirty, whether pure leadership, a program, or through my father's campaign for Congress . . . I learned the most out of trying different things and saying "wow, that really works," or "that didn't work at all," and then reflecting on it.

The responses from the Naval Academy exchange midshipmen from the focus groups interviewed were in concert with those provided by the Air Force Academy cadets. They continually emphasized the importance of role models and experience. USAFA cadet A believed leadership and role modeling were connected, "Cadets learn leadership from the officers they interact with and see on a daily basis." USAFA cadet B was in agreement concerning the importance of role modeling and leadership, and

thought “leadership is best learned through observation and mentorship.” USAFA cadet C emphasized the value of role modeling and experience in leadership development as well:

Leadership can be learned through experience . . . personal leadership challenges in day-to-day life and your observation of other especially your superiors have a great impact. Learning through example allows you the opportunity to learn what to do and what not to do.

USAFA cadet E, a senior cadet at Air Force, believed leadership was learned first by watching, then by practicing, and then, finally, by doing. These ideas concerning the importance of role modeling are also representative of the ideas presented by the USNA and USAFA instructors. The researcher found, however, an additional emphasis on the educational and training portion of leadership development. This is in keeping with Theme VIII of Kennedy’s (1998) Thesis: *Graduate students and leadership instructors learn about leadership by observing others, reflecting on their personal experiences, and interacting with the formal leadership theory.* USNA Instructor A, believed leadership could be learned in several different ways:

You can learn leadership theory in an educational setting . . . people learn leadership through their experiences . . . leadership is a natural part of a person’s personality so I think you can learn [leadership] academically, by observing and by participating in leadership, by trial and error, experimentation, and mentoring is another good way to learn leadership.

Similarly, USNA instructor B, believed in the importance of the triad of education, training, and experience for leadership development:

Education is a part of leadership development but not the sole source . . . you have the training portion that they get on YPs [Yard Patrol Crafts] and summer training, and then their experience with the school of hard knocks and everyone gets. Whether they’re experiencing it or observing it, they’re getting it in Bancroft Hall as well. It is this combination of all

these three [education, observation, and training] through the four years here that develops them and takes them from A to Z.

USNA instructor C, held a similar definition, “Just as art is learned. [Leadership is learned] partly with natural instincts, partly by watching others or to some extent in a classroom environment, and my experience.” USNA instructor D, a naval aviator from the Character Development department, believed leadership was learned through “example, role-modeling, practical experience, and education.”

The Air Force Academy instructors held a similar view as the Naval Academy instructors, which, again, emphasized the educational component of leadership development that the midshipmen/cadets did not emphasize. USAFA instructor A believed “leadership was something inside you, but can be drawn out through education and experience.” Similarly, USAFA instructor B, a retired USAF Survival, Evasion, Resistance, Escape instructor, emphasized the importance of trial and error, experience, and education. “[Leadership is learned] from trial and error. By making mistakes and it can be learned from watching others mistakes. It can be learned from others, from education, presentations, reading . . . the person has to be receptive to it.”

The ideas presented by the USNA and USAFA instructors were in agreement and emphasized the importance of education, experience, and training for leadership development. Midshipmen and cadets placed a greater emphasis on the observation aspect of the leadership and character development process because the Air Force Academy and the Naval Academy have not placed officer development as a top priority. The lack of time and credits afforded to these programs as compared to other academy endeavors, as well as the lack of academic credentials at the Naval Academy, provide evidence to support this argument. This lack of emphasis is related to two areas that are discussed in the sections on Theme VI, *More time, credits, and emphasis should be placed on leadership and character development*, and Theme VII, *Naval Academy leadership faculty and character instructors need more academic qualifications*.

The senior USNA and USAFA officers believed education, training, and experience are essential to the learning of leadership. Senior USNA officer A, believed

that, “yes [you can teach leadership] and whether or not it is learned is a personal thing, but education, training, and experience is how you teach it.” Senior USNA officer B, an O-5 (Commander), assigned to the Leadership Department, also believed in the importance of experience and education as a part of learning leadership:

Leadership development, or learning, will fail if taught in the classroom and left alone. It is here that the service academies possess the unique ability to practice in a somewhat safe environment the complex issues of leadership and human behavior. We can study ourselves, we can learn how to learn about and communicate with other people, but until we practice it and perfect it, we have essentially nothing other than leadership ‘knowledge.’ Leadership is also a skill that requires practice, errors, lessons learned, reflection, and so on and so on that the skills continue to refine and polish.

The senior staff at the Air Force Academy looked at leadership development in the same light as the USNA and USAFA instructors, and the senior USNA staff. Senior USAFA officer A believed that modeling, education, and experience were essential to leadership development.

[Leadership is learned] by modeling after someone else. I think all the service academies do a good job teaching what leadership looks like from an educational standpoint, but the great thing about all the academies is the underclass get to watch leadership in action. They can see and learn good leadership techniques and bad leadership techniques and model the ones they like. After education and observation, they get to try it and it is trial and error.

Senior USAFA officer B, an O-5 (Lieutenant Colonel) assigned to the Character Development Department (CWC) also advocated the importance of experience and education. “The classroom part shows what leadership is. The leadership laboratory part provides the successes and failures and allows a cadet to decide what to use and what not to use. Leadership lessons allow a cadet to internalize things a lot more.”

The data suggest the instructors and senior officers at USNA and USAFA view leadership development as a triad of sorts comprised of education, training, and experience while the cadets and midshipmen focused on the only the experience. The senior officers at the Army War College were in agreement with the other officer sub groups.

Senior Naval officer B suggested:

Scholarship [in terms of leadership development], certainly . . . Case studies, history, role models, all of these things that we even learn here at the Army War College, case histories of leaders such as Eisenhower, leadership techniques, all applied differently based on the level he was charged with. I do think you can teach that and I do think people learn from that.

Senior Naval officer C, also believed in the importance of experience and education and believed that “Leadership is learned through experience and some education.” Similarly, Senior Naval Officer A strongly emphasized the scholarship aspect of leadership development:

I believe strongly that there is [a scholarship aspect to leadership]. One of the things I find here at the Army War College is that you have to, there are certain things you have to read and study, analyze, think about, learn from . . . you need to read the quality books, the quality papers, the quality written material, and the case studies.

The senior Air Force officers at the Army War College held a similar opinion to those already presented from the officer corps. Senior Air Force officer B offered this viewpoint, “the way I look at leadership, and the way I think the Naval Academy looks at leadership, is that they have a triad, one part of it is experience, one part of it is training, and one part of it is scholarship.”

3. Conclusion

The ideas presented by the midshipmen and cadets were consistent with the ideas presented by Kennedy (1998). That is, leadership is learned by midshipmen and cadets through the observation of role models, reflecting on their personal experiences, and by actively experimenting with a variety of leadership styles. Furthermore, the comments of the officer instructors and senior officers at the service academies and the Army War College all emphasized the need for the triad of leadership development: education, experience, and training. It is this triad that separates our service academies from other institutions. The views presented by the officers reinforced the ideas presented by Kennedy (1998), which emphasized that graduate students and leadership instructors learn about leadership by observing others, reflecting on personal experiences, and interacting with formal leadership theory and training.

D. THEME III: CHARACTER IS ABOUT DOING THE RIGHT THING

1. Theme

The common definition throughout the interview process, both at the midshipmen/cadet level and the officer level, was the idea that character and ‘doing the right thing because it’s right’ were synonymous. First, this common definition of character by all involved reflects the Air Force and Navy’s core values as discussed in Chapter II. Second, the idea of character is directly linked to the ideas concerning officership as discussed in Chapter III.

2. Justification

During the focus group sessions, email surveys, and interview sessions, the researcher asked the interviewees (midshipmen, cadets, and officers) to explain what character was. All four sub-groups answered in a similar fashion. A member of the midshipmen Second-Class focus group defined character as “what man strives to do that is right . . . a combination of the values you have and being able to put those values in a situation and make tough decisions.” The First-Class focus group agreed on an easy definition, “integrity.” USAFA cadet A believed in the old cliché that character was

“doing what is right when no one is looking and under any circumstance.” USAFA cadet D also maintained a similar definition using the old cliché, “character is doing what’s right when no one is looking.” USAFA cadet B defined character as “the driving principles from which a person acts and make decisions. They [these principles] consist of morals and ideas that are of great importance to that individual.”

The USNA and USAFA instructors all defined character in terms of doing the right thing. Additionally, the senior academy officers defined character in a similar fashion. Senior USNA officer B defined character as “a combination of a person’s moral and physical courage, honesty, and integrity.” Senior USNA officer A referred to character as “the conscious of your inner-being, knowing and doing what is right.”

The senior officers at the Army War College had similar definitions for character and held it in very high regard, as did the service academy officers, in terms of officer-like qualities. Senior Air Force officer A, an O-6 and a former Deputy Commandant at the Air Force Academy, defined character “as leadership in action.” He believed leadership and mentoring came from character. Similarly, the senior Naval Officers at the Army War College defined character as “doing the right thing.”

3. Conclusions

The data suggests that when looking at character and moral leadership, doing what is right is the epitome of personal character. The unity of definition among the sub-groups is important because it shows how the academies impart the ideals of character and a common language in terms of moral development. Additionally, it can be concluded based on the information presented in Chapter III that personal character and integrity are the cornerstone of moral leadership and need to be nurtured for proper officer development.

E. THEME IV: INTEGRATION BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENTS AT BOTH SERVICE ACADEMIES NEEDS TO BE INCREASED

1. Theme

All four sub groups agreed that integration between the character and leadership development programs is important and essential. The researcher asked all four sub groups if the leadership and character programs at the service academies were integrated effectively or if they should be integrated. All the sub-groups agreed that the integration of character and leadership development is fundamental for future officers. Furthermore, there was agreement among the senior officers at the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy that the service academies are communicating and cooperating better now than they have in the past. As far as the extent of integration, the senior officers at the Army War College could not offer any observations or recommendations because of their lack of experience with the current programs at Navy and Air Force.

2. Justification

During the focus group sessions, email surveys, and interview sessions, the researcher asked the interviewees (midshipmen, cadets, and officers) if the character and leadership programs at Navy and Air Force should be more closely coordinated at their institutions and if that was occurring. The midshipmen/cadet sub-group emphasized the importance of integration but highlighted a lack of integration at their respective service schools. The USNA/USAFAs instructors and senior USNA/USAFAs officers also stressed the significance of character and leadership development integration but also spoke to the current problems of coordination at Navy and Air Force due to areas of responsibility. The senior Army War College officers spoke about the need for integration but could not speak to the extent of current program integration at the respective academies. The Second-Class midshipmen focus group critiqued the current state of program integration when one member said simply, “there is not enough of it [program integration] at either Academy.” Additionally, other Second-Class midshipmen added, “I don’t think they are integrated that well . . . certain things that you learn in

leadership apply to character.” The Air Force cadets held similar views. USAFA cadet E noted “a lack of synergy” between the two programs out at Air Force.

Similar to the responses from the midshipmen and cadets, the USNA and USAFA instructors also noted a lack of coordination between the two programs that could be improved upon. USNA instructor B described the current state of program integration at the Naval Academy in this way:

It is interesting that leadership is in a department with Seamanship and Navigation (SEANAV) where I think Leadership and Character development being co-located within the same department would espouse better things. But you have the opposite: steaming ships in one department with maneuvering boards on one end and academic leadership theory on the other. If you put leadership with character development, there will be a stronger pool of instructors to teach both leadership and character development. That way, one voice, one mission, one message.

USNA instructor C offered an interesting reason for integration of the two programs. He believed the programs need to be integrated because “they are inherently integrated everywhere else, both in the Fleet and in life.” USNA instructor F agreed that program integration “should be the goal . . . if we are teaching leadership without character we are doing something wrong.”

The instructors at Air Force emphasized the necessity of combining the message taught in a leadership context and relating that to the character seminars. USAFA instructor C pointed out:

That is why there is an emphasis for bringing back the core leadership course . . . to have education the first two years in leadership, and as a junior and senior have “Leaders in Flight Today” (LIFT) and the Academy Character Enrichment Seminars (ACES), which they can use as reflection tools. Being able to tie in character training and leadership education is key.

When asked about whether or not the leadership and character development programs at the Air Force Academy needed to be integrated, both USAFA instructors A and D, answered in similar fashion, “yes, they have to be.”

The senior USNA and USAFA officers offered additional insight into the program integration question. The senior USNA officers all agreed that integration was necessary. Senior USNA officer A, believed there needed to be “one vision, one voice” and it is a “tall order because of the areas of responsibility and spans of control at the Naval Academy.” He believed that the Division of Professional Development was an “anomaly and enigma” at the same time because in one division there are instructors for seamanship, tactics, ethics, leadership, philosophy, and naval law. It is a collection of “really bright people” but “needs to be grouped differently.” Senior USNA officer C, an O-6 (Captain), also believed in the “one vision, one voice” and advocated more integration between the leadership and character development instructors to provide a common voice. Similarly, senior USNA officer D, an O-6, believed there was a need for “character throughout the courses offered at USNA” and that is why the Capstone programs offered by Character Development involve so many leadership and other instructors from across the Yard.

Senior USAFA officers offered similar ideas concerning program integration. Senior USAFA officer A, believed “the more integration, the better” because when “the Air Force Academy is talking about what it is going to be like in the real Air Force . . . they are trying to force the cadets to think about character and leadership in an applied setting.” Senior USAFA officer B, offered a similar perspective, and pointed out some of the character programs and how they are structured. He emphasized that the LIFT and ACES are in place to aid the cadets but also as “an attempt to have character in education across the Academy” as discussed by the Senior USNA officers. Senior USAFA officer C, an O-6 (Colonel), spoke about the need for integration between the programs as well and emphasized “a common vision across the Terrazzo (Air Force Academy Training and Education Area) and across the curriculum.” Furthermore, the senior officers from both Air Force and Navy emphasized that leadership faculty and character development staff were “crossing divisional lines” and taking part in leadership theory development and character development seminars. Finally, the senior officers at both institutions

emphasized the need for the involvement of the entire faculty in leadership and character development missions of each Academy but that involvement has been less than anticipated and needs to be revitalized.

Finally, the senior officers at the Army War College all emphasized the need for integration but could not comment directly on the current status of service academy programs. Senior Air Force officer B believed “in terms of leadership and character, you can’t have one without the other, they are inter-related. Senior Air Force officer A suggested by not integrating character and leadership, “one would have a three-legged stool, missing two legs, it just doesn’t work.” Similarly, Senior Navy officer D, an O-5 (Commander), believed that “without character one can not lead” so program integration “needs to happen.”

3. Conclusions

The data suggest that integration of the service academies’ leadership and character development programs is necessary and it is occurring informally. A major integration point, according to the senior officers at each service academy, could involve the rest of the civilian and military faculties. The civilian and military faculty that are not involved in leadership education or the character development program do not seem to be fully engaged in either academies’ mission. The Air Force’s ACES program and the Naval Academy’s Character Development Seminar (CDS) CAPSTONE program provide those faculty who are not directly associated with leadership education or the character development program to experience a glimpse of the officer development effort at each academy.

F. THEME V: COOPERATION AND SYNERGY BETWEEN THE SERVICE ACADEMIES NEEDS TO BE INCREASED

1. Theme

Cooperation and synergy between the service academies in the areas of leadership and character development needs to be improved. The researcher’s entering argument for this was that officer development, leadership and character, should be the same for all

professional military officers. The area for diversity is in the execution because officers in the Army, Marine Corps, and Special Operation Units have different demands than those leading regular Navy and Air Force assets. The researcher asked in the officer sub-groups if the integration between the service academies, in terms of cooperation and synergy of programs, was adequate and if it should be improved. The overarching opinion from all of the service officers interviewed was that cooperation among all the service academies in the areas of leadership and character was necessary to provide a baseline of expectancy for all officers within the military profession.

2. Justification

During the interview sessions, the researcher asked the interviewees (USNA/USAFA instructors and senior Academy officers, and senior service officers at the Army War College) to explain if the service academies should be more integrated in their approaches to character and leadership development. All the sub-groups agreed that integration of the programs was necessary and that it could be improved to provide a common vision for service academy officers.

USNA instructor B thought that “there is a core competency of officership that all the services have.” He commented further, “there is this core competency for an officer and there can be service-specific information for the Air Force and the Army, but we all need to be teaching the same core competencies.” Similarly, USNA instructor C believed the programs should “always be integrated because inter-service academy conferences and frequent discussion between equivalent divisions/departments would help the sharing of good ideas, and allow all the academies to learn from the not so good ideas.” USNA instructor D recommended an annual meeting of “all academies and several representatives from their character development and leadership departments.” USNA instructor F held:

There’s no need to re-invent the wheel especially in the areas of leadership and character development where we [USNA] have so many instructors who are rolling through here. It would give us some more overall continuity in the current staff and the ties between the academies and between the permanent staff.

The instructors at the Air Force Academy viewed the integration in the same manner as the instructors from the Naval Academy, that is, cooperation is necessary and can be improved upon. USAFA instructor A, commented:

Communication is the biggest problem right now. We try to have a common language in the joint warfare arena, why can't there be one in terms of leadership and character development.

USAFA instructor B believed that "character and leadership is the same and should be the same across the board." USAFA instructor C, offered these thoughts:

I wouldn't say that USNA, USMA (United States Military Academy), and USAFA have to teach the exact same thing because there are fundamental differences between the services that need to be addressed. The Air Force, and the Navy, are a little more technical and the Army, and the Marine Corps, are a little more interpersonal. There might be different aspects to that but there are certain aspects [of leadership and character] that should be and need to be taught at all the service academies. General Ridgeway's "CCC" model and the Leader, Follower, and Situation (LFS) model are two that come to mind. We are developing professional officers who need to have a basic competency in terms of leadership and character.

USAFA instructor D, summarized all the instructor level inputs with his response, "absolutely [integration needs to happen], a professional officer can not learn all the lessons necessary in a stovepipe."

The senior USNA and USAFA officers offered similar responses to the question of service academy integration in the areas of leadership and character development. Senior USNA officer A, suggested that "there is a common expectation of Navy leadership, Air Force leadership, and Army leadership." Senior USNA officer C, held a similar view, "a professional military officer is a professional military officer," and "to make things better the service academies need to talk more." Similarly, senior USNA officer D believed that "the inter-service academy communication in this area has gotten better but like everything else, we can improve the process."

The senior officers at the Air Force Academy also believed that inter-service academy communication can and should be improved. Senior USAFA officer A thought:

It would be great to share ideas on a regular basis. The principles of leadership and character are the same but the execution, in terms of leadership, are different in each of the services . . . the strategic goals of leadership are the same, but the tactical implementation should be different.

Similarly, senior USAFA officer B, advocated more annual seminars including all of the service academies. Senior USAFA C, believed that “the sharing of ideas across service lines is critical and there is no substitute for it.” He suggested, “the more exposure and opportunities cadets and midshipmen receive while at the academies, the better off they will be as junior officers.” The senior USNA and USAFA officers were in agreement that the current Leadership and Character Development conferences and symposiums were “a step in the right direction.”

The senior service officers at the Army War College offered similar opinions on this topic as well. Senior naval officer B suggested “they [the service academies] should be drawing off the best practices of one another.” Senior naval officer A believed “integration is important because a true leader has a basic grounding in both leadership and character.” Similarly, senior Navy officer C suggested “there needs to more service academy integration to provide the basic principles and understanding of leadership and character.”

The senior Air Force officers at the Army War College held a similar view on inter-service academy integration. Senior Air Force officer A believed there should be a “template for the service academy experience that emphasizes leadership and character development that is reflective of their service.” Senior Air Force officer B, suggested the need for integration at the service academy level and at the officer accession level to include the Reserve Officer Training Course (ROTC) and Officer Candidate School (OCS):

Inter-service academy communication should be improved, but the same goes for ROTC and non-academy commissioning sources; we are all in the same military, and we are all supposed to be professional military officers . . . It gives, in today's joint environment, a better perspective. I need to know how a Navy officer thinks, I need to know how an Army officer thinks . . . this will help.

3. Conclusion

The data suggest inter-service academy communication is improving especially with leadership and character conferences and symposiums held the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, West Point, and the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. All of these programs provide a great opportunity for cadets and midshipmen to experience the different flavors of military service and military life. The ideas of those interviewed reinforced the idea the military as a profession and legitimacy of service as discussed in Chapter III by emphasizing the need for service academy cooperation and synergy. The biggest area for improvement is communication at the instructor and coordinator level. The instructors and senior officers, at both Air Force and Navy, suggested a need for increased communication to better their respective programs based on the critiques and lessons learned from the other service academies.

G. THEME VI: MORE TIME, CREDITS, AND EMPHASIS SHOULD BE PLACED ON LEADERSHIP AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

1. Theme

All four sub-groups suggested a need for increased awareness concerning leadership and character development issues. The senior officers from the Army War College could not comment directly on the current programs but reiterated the need for increased emphasis on leadership and character. The remaining sub-groups all commented on the need for more emphasis on the leadership and character programs.

2. Justification

The researcher asked all four sub-groups for their recommendations concerning possible program improvements and asked the academy-specific sub groups,

midshipmen/cadets, instructors and senior academy officers, their impression of the academy administration's emphasis on leadership and character, and whether or not the service academies were promoting self-reflection and introspection. All four sub-groups recommended a continued emphasis on character and leadership development. The service-academy specific groups observed the emphasis on leadership and character development as evidenced in the missions of the institutions. Conversely, they commented directly on the lack of academic credit provided for leadership development (USNA), the lack of a freshmen leadership course (USAFA), and a lack of time provided to the character development seminars (USNA/USAFA).

Some members of the second-class midshipmen focus group commented that "a midshipman doesn't have enough time to step back and look at character development issues." They further advocated, "the more you talk about character and leadership and can hear other ideas, the better equipped you are to deal with situations and grasp what needs to be done, if we had more time, it would be better." The first-class midshipmen focus group stressed the importance of the A Day/B Day schedule (having classes assigned by period and day (A or B) instead of by credits hours) at the Air Force Academy that allowed them more free time to get things done and to actually be able to reflect on both academic and personal issues.

Similarly, the Air Force exchange cadets all commented on the need for more time for reflection. USAFA exchange cadet C spoke directly to the lack of a separate leadership course at the Air Force Academy.

At USAFA, there is not a separate leadership course. A couple of core classes attempt to teach the basics of leadership but there is neither continuity nor any amount of significant time spent on it.

The instructors at USNA and USAFA all spoke about the lack of emphasis on leadership and character issues identifying the lack of academic credit and/or time spent on character seminars. USNA instructor G commented on both the leadership and character development programs by saying,

I think leadership, in terms of being a professional military officer, is just as important as English, Calculus, and Chemistry. But if you look at the academic credits, leadership is not being emphasized . . . you can't be serious about character development if you push it to 4 to 8 o'clock at night or have it with a brown bag lunch, but only allocating 4 hours a semester for three years and 8 hours as a firstie, 20 hours during four years, is that being serious?

USNA instructor B held a similar opinion concerning the leadership development program when he stated:

How they weigh things tells me how important they think leadership is . . . NL302 went from 3 units to 2 units and nothing was removed from the course . . . by devaluing the class credit they are saying leadership is less important than other classes. Yes, we graduate physics and chemistry majors but few people go out and use their degree right away, but all of them, 100% of USNA graduates use their leadership abilities and skills.

He further insisted on the popular argument of more time for character development, arguing that "20 hours over a four year career really isn't much."

Due to the lack of a core leadership course, the USAFA instructors all spoke about the need to revisit having leadership put back into the core curriculum. They further emphasized the need for more time for character development. USAFA instructor A, when asked if he had any recommendations for either leadership or character development, suggested:

We need more time, is 12, 14, 16, or 20 hours enough? I don't think so. If we truly want leaders with integrity and moral leadership we need to spend more time.

USAFA instructor B commented:

They graduate here with so many semester hours but no time to figure out what they did. If we tone down the academic schedule and focus on leadership and character development, the reasons behind the service academies, we would give cadets more time for self-reflection and development.

He added further that the “other service academies, whether its leadership or management, have a three-credit class.” USAFA instructor C promoted the idea that “on the leadership side there is no reflection time because of the lack of a core curriculum, and on the character side, they are missing reflection because the training seminars, although they promote it, don’t really have enough time to capture reflection.” USAFA instructor E believed the “requirements placed on cadets on a daily basis does not let them actively reflect on their academy experience.”

The senior USNA/USAFA officers observed the lack of institutional emphasis on character and leadership issues. Senior USNA officer B suggested leadership education and development took a back seat to summer training because of:

The notion of leadership faculty focusing more on teaching and scholarship is somewhat contrary to the command climate encouraging more emphasis on summer training and much less of faculty development. Attempts to block time in the summer months devoted to leadership faculty development have been met with resistance.

The senior officers at the Air Force Academy held similar views as well. According to Senior USAFA officer C, when you “only have seven lessons on leadership over a four-year career, its hard to say you are serious about it.” Senior USAFA officer B, commented on the “need to reinstitute the leadership core” while emphasizing the character development program that is already in place. Senior USAFA officer A, emphasized four pillars of an Academy education; academics, athletics, training, and character. He further advocated that “character should be the base for the other three

pillars” but “when we only spend 20 hours during a four-year career, it’s hard to claim that character is that base.” The senior officers from the Army War College all commented on the need for character and leadership education but could not comment directly on the current programs in place at Navy and Air Force.

3. Conclusion

The data suggest that leadership and character development are not getting their fair share of time at the Naval and Air Force Academies. The current leadership and management education courses and the character development programs can be referred to in Chapter IV. Allotting 20 hours over a four-year career for character development, when a midshipman spends five hours a week on calculus for three semesters places a higher priority on academics. Similarly, by placing two units of credit on leadership education, the lowest of any core class at Annapolis, or removing leadership from the core curriculum at Air Force, the idea of leadership becomes devalued.

H. THEME VII: NAVAL ACADEMY LEADERSHIP AND CHARACTER INSTRUCTORS NEED MORE ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

1. Theme

Naval Academy leadership faculty and character development staff lack advanced degrees to make them a viable academic department. As a result, leadership education and character development education are not given the merit their subject area deserves.

2. Justification

The researcher asked the midshipmen focus groups and the Naval Academy-specific sub-groups for recommendations to improve the character development program and leadership education at Annapolis. The impression all of the sub-groups portrayed was that the lack of advanced degrees in both character development staff and leadership education faculty affects the academic and program credibility. When asked about what to improve about the leadership and character development programs, one member of the First-Class midshipmen focus group responded, “first, start with people who have

advanced degrees. Make sure it is required not to just be a lieutenant but to have an advanced degree and experience in that subject area.” Similarly, the USNA instructors felt the lack of advanced degrees adversely affected their academic credibility status with the midshipmen and the overall faculty, which is half military and half civilian professors. USNA instructor F commented that, “the best short-term goal, should be to get a better training program for instructors because they are coming straight out of the Fleet.” USNA instructor G emphasized the need for a coherent training program but also advocated the need for leadership instructors having advanced degrees. He commented,

I think the LEAD program (Leadership Education and Development, a Master’s degree program primarily for company officers) should encompass more Leadership instructors. I do not see any difference between the Leadership instructors teaching leadership having a Master’s degree in leadership and the company officers having one. I think they all should have one but I would emphasize the instructors having one before the company officers. Why in the world would you put a guy with a Master’s degree in the Hall and not in the classroom teaching leadership theory? It just doesn’t make sense.

USNA instructor B further insisted on the need for advanced degrees in leadership. He commented on the other service academies and how “they put a lot of emphasis into their courses and instructors. They all get a Master’s degree beforehand.” USNA instructor H also emphasized “the administration thinks leadership is important but it, or the instructors, is not given the same focus as other departments on the Yard.” USNA instructor E insisted leadership and character development instructors should be required to “have an advanced degree in that area, either in leadership or an advanced degree in ethics or moral reasoning. That way you would have some academic merit, combined with Fleet or Fleet Marine Force (FMF) experience.”

The senior USNA officers further emphasized the need for officers with advanced degrees. Senior USNA officer A contended that “leadership needs more of a balance in terms of qualified instructors, more in line with the other service academies.” He further illustrated that “the scholarship portion of the leadership program measures up short due to the two-credit configuration, the preparation of instructors, and lack of advanced

degrees.” Senior USNA officer B reiterated the need for qualified instructors and spoke about the initiatives within the Strategic Plan (2002) that encompassed creating or providing qualified instructors. He commented:

Two years ago the Strategic Plan called for four leadership fellows . . . the idea behind the fellow plan was to take the place of a junior officer who was in the one-year Company Officer’s LEAD program. The desired outcome for this initiative was an increased number of young military officers with postgraduate education. Fiscal restraints limited the number to one a year . . . we were told to change the initiative to one a year to reflect reality since four a year would not be entertained.

Senior USNA officer C also suggested the need “for advanced degrees in the character development department for curriculum and program development.” The Strategic Plan has addressed that and a Permanent Military Professor will be assigned to Character Development in the future. He also emphasized the need for the junior officers to acquire advanced degrees “to provide insight into curriculum development.”

The biggest area of concern among the senior USNA officers was the Strategic Plan and the lack of executed initiatives or initiatives which were downgraded. Senior USNA officer C also emphasized the need for postgraduate education in the character development department to provide more “young officers with postgraduate education who can provide a different perspective on things.”

3. Conclusion

In terms of academic credentials, the leadership and character development faculty is lacking. Initiatives have been proposed, approved, and changed to reflect the institution’s emphasis towards leadership and character education. When compared to the other service academies, especially in terms leadership education, the Naval Academy falls short. Table 1 shows the academic qualifications within the leadership/management departments at the three service academies.

Table 1. A Comparison of Service Academy Leadership/Management Faculty

FACULTY	USNA	USMA	USAFA: (DFBL Note 1)	USAFA: (MGT Note 2)
Total Assigned	18	39	35	33
Civilian PhDs	2	7	9	8
Military PhDs	2	11	11	3
Military Master's Degree	2	21	15	21
Civilian Faculty Master's Degree	2	0	0	0
Military Faculty Bachelor's Degree	10	0	0	0
Adjunct Faculty (Average per Term)	18	0	0	0

Note 1: DFBL refers to the Department of Behavioral Science and Leadership

Note 2: MGT refers to the Department of Management

Source: McCausland, Jeff, Colonel, USA (retired), Class of 1961 Professor of Leadership, United States Naval Academy

The above table provides an overview of the leadership and management faculty assigned to the three service academies. “Total assigned” refers to the total faculty assigned to each department. “Civilian PhDs” refers to those civilian faculty within the respective department who possess a relevant doctorate degree. “Military PhDs” refers to those military faculty within the respective department who possess a relevant doctorate degree. “Military Master’s Degree” refers to those military instructors within the respective department who possess a relevant Master’s degree. Similarly, “Civilian Faculty Master’s Degree” refers to the civilian faculty who possess a relevant Masters degree. “Military Faculty Bachelor’s Degree” refers to the military faculty within the respective department who do not possess any relevant graduate degrees. Finally, “Adjunct Faculty” refers to instructors, from outside the leadership or management department, who teach leadership or management courses.

Table 1 and the interview data suggest a greater emphasis on educational merit at the other service academies as compared to Annapolis. The lack of advanced degrees and a lack of commitment to graduate education for leadership education instructors and character development staff illustrates the Naval Academy’s lack of emphasis on officer development. Furthermore, the necessitated dependency on more qualified adjunct faculty, who have other competing professional demands, to augment the leadership

faculty, further emphasizes the lack of priority on leadership education. Additionally, the lack of advanced degrees within the Character Development Department also subtracts from the credibility of that program in its academic endeavors for program design and implementation. The Strategic Plan (2002) and the Naval Academy's 1997 Board of Visitors Report acknowledged this deficiency of academic qualification but the progress has been minimal.

The USAFA officers who were interviewed were surprised by the lack of degrees possessed by their Annapolis counterparts. They, too, recommended the requirement for all leadership and character development instructors to attain an advanced degree prior to, or as part of, their Naval Academy tour.

I. SUMMARY

The researcher conducted interviews, focus groups, and email surveys of four distinct groups to determine what similarities and differences existed between the leadership and character development programs at the Naval and Air Force Academies and identify possible areas for improvement. The data collected suggested seven themes concerning leadership and character development. These seven themes provide the foundation for the researcher's conclusions and recommendations in Chapter VII.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VII: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

The United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Force Academy are both known for their integrated leadership and character development programs. The programs, and their integrated approaches, provide leadership and character education and the opportunity for cadets and midshipmen to experiment with the knowledge acquired during their four-year experience at their respective service academies. This integrated approach to leadership and character development separates the service academies from other educational institutions throughout the country. Considering the cost of educating a midshipmen or cadet, the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy are constantly scrutinized concerning their leadership abilities and character attributes. The cost at a service academy, based on the 1998 Government Accounting Office estimate, exceeds \$200,000 per graduate.

The overall assessment from outside sources is that the Air Force Academy and the Naval Academy are successfully producing qualified junior officers for their respective services (*"The Higher Standard,"* 1997 and *"Agenda for Change,"* 2003). But at a closer glance, especially in terms of leadership and character development, are Navy and Air Force doing all they could or should do for their officer development programs?

If the United States Air Force Academy and United States Naval Academy wish to continue to be recognized as the premier institutions for producing leaders of character, they must recognize and support the structures that are most responsible for the character and leadership development of cadets and midshipmen. The primary research question for this thesis was concerned with how leadership and character development instruction at the Air Force Academy differed from the Naval Academy and what the unique strengths and weaknesses of each academy's programs were.

Analysis of the leadership course structure and descriptions shows that the Air Force Academy presents less of an emphasis on leadership education and more of an emphasis on management education. The Air Force Academy offers a freshman year

human behavior course that only incorporates seven lessons of leadership and a junior year management course as compared to the two required leadership courses offered at the Naval Academy. Conversely, the academic credit afforded to the required leadership courses at the Naval Academy are less than any other offered course at Annapolis.

Furthermore, the academic credentials of the Air Force Academy military faculty in the area of leadership development and management theory far outweighs those of the Naval Academy military faculty as evidenced in Table One of Chapter VI. This comparison is in concert with the lack of overall commitment to graduate education within the Naval Service. The Naval Academy's Board of Visitors (1997) were concerned that the pool of unrestricted line officers with graduate degrees—from which USNA draws its military faculty—was shrinking. The academic qualifications of the officers associated with the leadership and character development programs at USNA epitomize this concern and Table One of Chapter VI further reinforces it. It is very difficult to mandate academic importance and relevance to programs, specifically leadership and character development, when credits awarded and instructor credentials do not support the mandate.

Analysis of the structure and content of the Character Development programs shows that the mandatory programs are very similar at the respective institutions. The programs are taught and presented to the cadets and midshipmen during the same period of their training, from freshmen to senior year, and have similar scope and descriptions. Again, the major difference in the institutions' character development program lies in the academic merit or experience level of those involved. The Air Force Academy has officers with advanced degrees or officers with more than 20 years of military leadership experience presenting the programs. Conversely, the Naval Academy only has one instructor within Character Development with a related advanced degree. An additional area of concern at the two service academies is time and emphasis. There seems to be a lack of emphasis on character development because of the lack of time spent on the character development programs. The following sections provide specific recommendations for the Air Force and Naval Academy for possible program improvements.

B. UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Air Force Academy has a strong commitment to graduate education and faculty development. All of the instructors within Department of Behavioral Science and Leadership earned one or multiple graduate degrees. Similarly, the instructors within Center of Character Development either have a graduate degree or more than 20 years of experience in the field of military leadership. The primary concern for the Air Force Academy is two-fold: time and emphasis. Based on interview and survey data, there seems to be a lack of emphasis in terms of hours allotted to character development. Over a four-year career, cadets only receive 20 hours of dedicated time to character development. Is it possible to consider an institution a center for character excellence when only 20 hours are spent on character during a cadet's four-year career? Similarly, if an institution is focused on leadership development, why are the required core courses focused on management?

Recommendations:

1. Engage the military and civilian faculty into the Air Force Academy's mission. For those civilian and military faculty not directly associated with leadership education or character development, require faculty and staff to take part in the character development program.
2. Integrate the leadership education and character development programs. Conduct semi-annual or annual workshops between the leadership faculty and character development staff at USAFA to develop new curricula that incorporates character and leadership development theory.
3. Mandate core leadership development courses. Air Force already has military faculty with advanced degrees in behavioral science and human factors engineering. Core courses would further support the Academy's emphasis on leader development.
4. Mandate additional hours to character development. Twenty hours over a four-year career is not enough. Investigate the possibility of academic credit for specific character development seminars.

C. UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Naval Academy's commitment to graduate education, especially for leadership and character development faculty, has been sub-par. The Naval Academy could benefit from the addition of more professional naval officers who serve as instructors. These instructors should be afforded the opportunity to obtain graduate or doctoral degrees prior to reporting in order to maintain the excellent academic reputation of the Naval Academy. It is very difficult to satisfy any academic requirements when the vast majority of faculty providing instruction in leadership theory, or introducing character development program, possess only Bachelor's Degrees. Similar to the argument presented in the previous section, the Naval Academy must allot more time to character development and the integration of the leadership and character development programs. The Board of Visitors (1997) emphasized the need for such integration but it has yet to come to fruition. Finally, if an institution is focused on leadership development, why does leadership rank last in academic credit at Annapolis?

Recommendations:

1. Engage the military and civilian faculty into the Naval Academy's mission. For those civilian and military faculty not directly associated with leadership education or character development, require faculty and staff to take part in the character development program. This can be accomplished through a more rigorous faculty orientation program.
2. Integrate the leadership education and character development programs. Conduct semi-annual or annual workshops between the leadership faculty and character development staff at USNA to develop new curricula that incorporates character and leadership development theory.
3. Task the Leadership, Ethics, and Law Department to provide the Academic Dean and the Commandant of Midshipmen with a comprehensive plan of a notional three-credit course. This format will promote additional leadership theory work and case study experiences for

experiential learning opportunities. It would also send a clear message of the institutional importance and academic merit to the courses.

4. Investigate the possibility of A Day/B Day Schedule. Having an A Day/B Day allows for more time for course work, self-reflection, and introspection. Leadership education and character development initiatives could be pursued during the training periods allotted by such a schedule.
5. Mandate additional hours to character development. Twenty hours over a four-year career is not enough. Investigate the possibility of academic credit for specific character development seminars.
6. Mandate a three-year tour for Leadership education faculty and character development staff. One year reserved for post-graduate work followed by a two-year faculty or staff position.
7. Use the Ethics (NE203) course structure example if unable to mandate three-year tour length. Leadership theory should be taught by degreed faculty followed by case study and practical application work by leadership instructors
8. Re-organize Officer Development. Character Development, Ethics, Leadership Education, and Law should be housed in the same department. Seamanship and Navigation and Professional Programs should be housed in the same department separate from those already discussed. The usefulness of the theories presented in terms of character, ethics, and leadership have been discussed in Chapter III. In order to professionalize officer development, some re-organization needs to take place.

D. AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The topics discussed in this thesis only touch the surface of leadership and character development. Due to the breadth of the subject matter, the researcher focused on the similarities and differences of the current officer development programs at the

Navy and Air Force. Leadership and character development play a major role in the professional development of midshipmen and cadets and the impact they can have on an officer's career can not be understated. The following are areas for further research:

1. During the research into the academic and character development programs at Air Force and Navy, a disparity appeared between the Air Force's and Navy's approach to graduate education. The Air Force Academy embraced officers with graduate degrees to teach their human behavior and management courses while the Naval Academy did not. Can this disparity be related to a service culture that emphasizes personal growth and education while another emphasizes operational experience? What role does graduate education play in the professional development of a military professional? Future research could further investigate these questions and their implications on officer development policies and practices.
2. The Naval Academy has been a launching point for many junior officers to pursue other career paths. The availability of graduate education has aided in improving junior officer retention. A future study investigating graduate education and its impact on junior officer retention during their Naval Academy tour could prove useful.
3. Due to time and fiscal constraints, the officer development programs of the United States Military Academy, United States Coast Guard Academy, United States Merchant Marine Academy were not explored in this thesis. Many of these institutions possess officer development programs comparable to the Air Force and Naval Academies. A future study can apply the concept of officership and the profession of a military officer to the aforementioned institutions.

4. The Naval Academy and Air Force Academy maintain annual Leadership/Character development symposiums. Further research concerning an annual Leadership/Character Development symposium at the service academies on a rotating basis emphasizing midshipmen/cadet and junior officer development could prove useful.
5. Due to time and fiscal constraints, private universities, such as the Virginia Military Institute, the Citadel, Texas A & M, and Virginia Tech, which have recognized leadership development programs were not explored in this thesis. A future study can apply the concept of officership and the profession of a military officer to the private universities with recognized programs.
6. Leadership theory and character development have been the subject of many books and essays. As a result, there is a multitude of theories that relate to military leadership and officer development. A future study could further investigate officer development and the relationship to current and past leadership theory and how that relates to the current leadership education at the service academies. Similarly, character, the components of character, and the stages of moral development provide an excellent opportunity to determine the relationship of character development and the current programs at the service academies.
7. One of the entering arguments of this thesis was that there are certain criteria necessary for a professional military officer to succeed and those criteria are the same regardless of service. A continuous mechanism for dialogue regarding leadership and character development particular to the development of the junior officer staff and faculty of the service

academies does not currently exist. All too often, the emphasis of officer development is pinpointed on the midshipmen and cadets and the professional development of the young junior officers is neglected. A future study concerning the implementation of a mentorship program and development of the junior officers assigned to academy duty would be beneficial.

8. The Navy has conducted several “30-Something” conferences, sponsored by the Center for Executive Education at the Naval Postgraduate School. These are three-or four-week exercises that creates an environment in which young Navy and Marine Corps officers can share their ideas for the future of the Department of the Navy (DoN) with senior leadership.¹⁵ Due to the Naval Academy’s close proximity to Washington D.C. and the Pentagon, an annual “30-Something” conference between junior officers assigned to the Naval Academy and senior project officers assigned to the Pentagon might prove valuable in the sharing of new ideas for the future of the Navy. A future study looking at the possibility and potential benefits of such a program would be useful for the development of the junior officers assigned to the Naval Academy.
9. As discussed in Chapter III, the concept of the military as a profession is based on the legitimacy of such a profession and it has been argued that a professional military officer is a professional military officer regardless of service branch. Should that not be the same regardless of commissioning source? A future study examining the possible cooperation and synergy between Reserved Officer Training Course leadership education and character development programs and those of our service academies would be useful in ensuring that all accession sources are emphasizing the same standard in terms of officer development.

¹⁵ http://www.cee.nps.navy.mil/NewSite/thirty_something.asp

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Athens, A, Colonel, USMC (ret.) (2003). Speech. National Maritime Leadership Conference. United States Merchant Marine Academy. 7 April 2003.
- Burk, J (2002). Expertise, Jurisdiction, and Legitimacy of the Military Profession. In L.J. Mathews (ed.) The Future of the Army Profession. United States Military Academy: McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Depree, M. (1989). Leadership is an Art. New York, NY: Bantam Dell.
- Huntington, S.P. (1957). The Soldier and the State. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kennedy, Robert. (1998). Leadership Development Revisited: An Assessment of Midshipmen Learning Process at the United States Naval Academy. Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School.
- Marshall, T.H. (1939). "The Recent History of Professionalism in Relations to Social Structure and Social Policy." In Class, Citizenship, & Social Development Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1998). The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- McCausland, J. Colonel, USA (ret.), (2003). Interview. 15 and 29 April 2003.
- Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman, A. Michael. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. New York, NY: Doubleday Publishing.
- Stockdale, J.B. Vice Admiral (1984). "The Principles of Leadership." In A Vietnam Experience: Ten Years of Reflection. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution.
- Thomas, Robert. (2000). Teaching Tomorrow's Leaders: A Comparison of leadership development at the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy. Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School.
- Ulmer, W.F., Collins, J.J., Jacobs, T.O. (2000). American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century: A Report of the CSIS International Security Program. The Center for Strategic and International Studies, The CSIS Press. 2000.

United States Air Force Academy. "Agenda for Change (2003)." From the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff Air Force.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Core Values. [On-Line].
<http://www.usafa.af.mil/core-value/index.cfm>. May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Mission of the United States Air Force Academy. [On-Line] <http://www.usafa.af.mil/misvis/> May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Strategic Plan (2001). [On-Line]
<http://www.usafa.af.mil/xp/xpr/stratplan/overview.html> May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Vision of the United States Air Force Academy. [On-Line] <http://www.usafa.af.mil/misvis/> May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). United States Air Force Academy Curriculum Handbook: Class of 2006 and Beyond.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). United States Air Force Academy VECTOR Facilitators Guide 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). Character Development Seminar Descriptions. [On-Line] http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/seminars/seminars_index.html. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2002). Mission of the United States Naval Academy. Reefpoints (2002).

United States Naval Academy (2003). NE203 Course Description. [On-Line]
<http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/ne203/index.html>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). NL112 Course Description. [On-Line]
<http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/nl112/index.html>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). NL302 Course Description. [On-Line]
<http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/nl302/index.html>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). United States Naval Academy Strategic Plan 2002. [On-Line]. <http://www.usna.edu/strategicplan/>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy Board of Visitors (1997). "The Higher Standard: Assessing the United States Naval Academy." The Report of the Special Committee to the Board of Visitors, United States Naval Academy. June 1997.

United States Navy (2003). Core Values of the Naval Service.
<http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/traditions/html/corvalu.html>. May 2003.

United States Navy (2003). Department of the Navy 2000 Posture Statement.
<http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/policy/fromsea/pos00/pos-top.html>. May 2003.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, John R. (2002). Commandant's Intent (version 14 Feb 02). United States Naval Academy: Annapolis.
- Athens, A, Colonel, USMC (ret.) (2003). Speech. National Maritime Leadership Conference. United States Merchant Marine Academy. 7 April 2003.
- Brennan, J. G. (1992). Foundations of Moral Obligation: The Stockdale Course. Newport, RI: Naval War College.
- Builder, C. H. (1989). The Masks of War: American Military Styles in Strategy and Analysis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burk, J (2002). Expertise, Jurisdiction, and Legitimacy of the Military Profession. In L.J. Mathews (ed.) The Future of the Army Profession. United States Military Academy: McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Crosby, P. (1996). The Absolutes of Leadership. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Depree, M. (1989). Leadership is an Art. New York, NY: Bantam Dell.
- Gill, R. (1997). Moral Leadership in a Post-Modern Age. Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, LTD.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Hesselbein, Frances (2002). Hesselbein on Leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hitt, W. D. (1990). Ethics and Leadership: Putting Theory into Practice. Columbus, OH: Battelle Press.
- Huntington, S.P. (1957). The Soldier and the State. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Judge, W.Q. (1999). The Leader's Shadow: Exploring and Developing Executive Character. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kaplan, R.D. (2002). Warrior Politics: Why Leadership Demands a Pagan Ethos. New York, NY: Random House Publishers.

Kennedy, Robert. (1998). Leadership Development Revisited: An Assessment of Midshipmen Learning Process at the United States Naval Academy. Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School.

Kiser, S.L. (1954). The American Concept of Leadership. New York, NY: Pageant Press.

Kolenda, C.D. (2001). Leadership: The Warrior Art. Carlisle, PA: Army War College Foundation Press.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2002). Leadership: The Challenge. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Landis, L.C. (1959). The Story of the U.S. Air Force Academy. New York, NY: Rinehart & Company, INC.

London, M. (2002). Leadership Development: Paths to Self-Insight and Professional Growth. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Lovell, J. P. (1979). Neither Athens Nor Sparta? The American Service Academies in Transition. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Margiotta, F.D. (1978). The Changing World of the American Military. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Marshall, T.H. (1939). "The Recent History of Professionalism in Relations to Social Structure and Social Policy." In Class, Citizenship, & Social Development Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Matthews, Colonel L. J., USA (Retired), (2001). Building and Maintaining Healthy Organizations: The Key to Future Success. Department of Command, Leadership, and Management United States Army War College.

Maxwell, J. C. (1998). The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

McCausland, J. Colonel, USA (ret.), (2003). Interview. 15 and 29 April 2003.

McCauley, C.D., Moxley, R.S., Van Velsor, E (1998). The Center for Creative Leadership: Handbook of Leadership Development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman, A. Michael. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Morrell, M. & Capparell, S (2001). Shackleton's Way: Leadership Lessons from the Great Antarctic Explorer. New York, NY: The Penguin Group.

Orbis, *A Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 43, No. 1, Winter 1999

Peterson, D.B. & Hicks, M.D. (1996). Leader as Coach: Strategies for Coaching and Developing Others. Minneapolis, MN: Personnel Decisions International

Potts, Tom & Sykes, Arnold (1993). Executive Talent: How to Identify and Develop the Best. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.

Schein, E.H. (1992). Organizational Culture and Leadership (2nd Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Senge, P.M. (1990). The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. New York, NY: Doubleday Publishing.

Smith, J.M. (1998). USAF Culture and Cohesion: Building an Air and Space Force for the 21st Century. USAF Academy, CO: USAF Institute for National Security Studies.

Stockdale, J.B. Vice Admiral (1984). "The Principles of Leadership." In A Vietnam Experience: Ten Years of Reflection. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution.

Thomas, Robert. (2000). Teaching Tomorrow's Leaders: A Comparison of leadership development at the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy. Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School.

Ulmer, W.F., Collins, J.J., Jacobs, T.O. (2000). American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century: A Report of the CSIS International Security Program The Center for Strategic and International Studies, The CSIS Press. 2000.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Academy Training Philosophy Handbook. United States Air Force Academy.

United States Air Force Academy. "Agenda for Change (2003)." From the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff Air Force.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Core Values. [On-Line]. <http://www.usafa.af.mil/core-value/index.cfm>. May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Mission of the United States Air Force Academy. [On-Line] <http://www.usafa.af.mil/misvis/> May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Strategic Plan (2001). [On-Line] <http://www.usafa.af.mil/xp/xpr/stratplan/overview.html>. May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). Vision of the United States Air Force Academy. [On-Line] <http://www.usafa.af.mil/misvis/> May 2003.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). United States Air Force Academy Curriculum Handbook: Class of 2006 and Beyond.

United States Air Force Academy (2003). United States Air Force Academy VECTOR Facilitators Guide 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). Character Development Seminar Descriptions. [On-Line] http://www.usna.edu/CharacterDevelopment/seminars/seminars_index.html. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2002). Mission of the United States Naval Academy. Reefpoints (2002).

United States Naval Academy (2003). NE203 Course Description. [On-Line] <http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/ne203/index.html>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). NL112 Course Description. [On-Line] <http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/nl112/index.html>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). NL302 Course Description. [On-Line] <http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/LEL/nl302/index.html>. May 2003.

United States Naval Academy (2003). United States Naval Academy Strategic Plan 2002. [On-Line]. <http://www.usna.edu/strategicplan/> May 2003.

United States Naval Academy Board of Visitors (1997). "The Higher Standard: Assessing the United States Naval Academy." The Report of the Special Committee to the Board of Visitors, United States Naval Academy. June 1997.

United States Navy (2003). Core Values of the Naval Service. <http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/traditions/html/corvalu.html>. May 2003.

United States Navy (2003). Department of the Navy 2000 Posture Statement. <http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/policy/fromsea/pos00/pos-top.html>. May 2003.

Welchel, S. & Sieden, O.J. (1982). Your Air Force Academy. Boulder, CO: Rocky Mountain Writers Guild Publication.

Wren, J.T. (1995). The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages. New York, NY: The Free Press.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Commandant of Midshipmen, United States Naval Academy
United States Naval Academy
Office of the Commandant
Annapolis, Maryland
4. Commandant of Cadets, United States Air Force Academy
United States Air Force Academy
Office of the Commandant
Colorado Springs, Colorado
5. Director, Division of Professional Development
United States Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland
6. Director, Division of Behavioral Science and Leadership
United States Air Force Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado
7. Director, Division of Character Development
United States Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland
8. Director, Center for Character Development
United States Air Force Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado
9. Alice Crawford
Naval Postgraduate School
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy
Monterey, California
10. Colonel Jeff McCausland, USA (retired)
Leadership, Ethics, and Law Department
United States Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland

11. Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Peter Volpe
Coram, New York
12. Captain and Mrs. Kenneth W. Kuehne
Millersville, Maryland
13. Lieutenant Dennis J. Volpe
Annapolis, Maryland